DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 979 SO 005 426

AUTHOR	Fraser, Stewart E., Ed.
TITLE	International Education: Understandings and Misunderstandings.
INSTITUTION	George Peabody Coll. for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn. Peabody International Center.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	International Center, Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee 37203 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Education; Educational Development; Educational Needs; Educational Philosophy; Educational Problems; *International Education; Sex Education
IDENTIFIERS	Africa; Latin America; United States

ABSTRACT

This collection of symposium papers is concerned with various aspects of understandings and misunderstandings in international education. The discussion of comparative education involves a variety of topics ranging from educational philosophy to sex education. The five papers are: (1) Foreign Interpretations and Misinterpretations of American Education: Historical Notes by Steward E. Fraser analyzes some prominent nineteenth century commentaries and criticisms made of American education by foreign visitors and educators; (2) Comprehensions and Apprehensions Concerning American Educational Philosophy by Brian Holmes; (3) Discernments Concerning United States Educational Aid to African Nations by Franklin Parker discusses educational problems of Africa and the involvement of America in the educational development of various African nations; (4) Towards a Study of Comparative Sex Education: Conceptions and Misconceptions by Robert M. Bjork identifies problems faced by nations and successful accomplishments of school systems throughout the world as they introduce the subject of sex education; and (5) Latin America: Educational Perceptions by Harold R. W. Benjamin stresses pressing educational needs in Latin America. (Author/SJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 073979

International Education: Understandings and Misunderstandings

Edited by
STEWART E. FRASER

$ 0005426

A Symposium Sponsored by
Alpha Pi Chapter
Kappa Delta Pi
Peabody International Center

CONTRIBUTORS:

Harold R. W. Benjamin
Robert M. Pjork
Stewart E. Fraser
Brian Holmes
Franklin Parker

Library of Congress Catalogue Card No. 69-16547

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Published by
Peabody International Center
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee
1969

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION:
UNDERSTANDINGS AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS

Peabody International Center

Research Monographs in International and Comparative Education

Editor: Stewart E. Fraser

Jullien's Plan for Comparative Education 1816-1817, published by Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Governmental Policy and International Education, published by John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Chinese Communist Education: Records of the First Decade, published by Vanderbilt University Press, 1965; and Science Editions, John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

The Evils of a Foreign Education: or Birdsey Northrop on Education Abroad, 1873, published by Peabody International Center, 1966.

Mao Tse-tung's Quotations: The Red Guard's Handbook, published by Peabody International Center, 1967.

A History of International and Comparative Education: Nineteenth-Century Documents, published by Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968. [Co-edited with William W. Brickman.]

American Education in Foreign Perspectives, published by John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

International Education: Understandings and Misunderstandings, published by Peabody International Center, 1969.

FORTHCOMING:

Education and Communism in China: An Anthology of Commentary and Analysis, published by Pall Mall Press, Ltd., London.

Ludvig Holberg's Memoirs: A Danish Eighteenth Century Contribution to International Understanding, published by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Holland.

Dedicated to

WILLARD GOSLIN

With affection, by his colleagues at Peabody College
in recognition of a lifetime devotion to fostering
"international educational understanding."

O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us.
—Robert Burns

Acknowledgments

The series of lectures which constitute the symposium on "Understandings and Misunderstandings" was arranged through the enterprising leadership of the officers and members of the Alpha Pi Chapter of Kappa Delta Pi, Peabody College. The editor of the papers emanating from the symposium is especially indebted to the following for graciously facilitating the publication of the proceedings: to Dr. John M. Claunch, President of Peabody College, for encouraging and supporting the symposium; to Dr. Ida Long Rogers, faculty sponsor of the Alpha Pi Chapter, for her thoughtful stimulation; to the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce for its financial support of a program dedicated to the improvement of the community's understanding of international education; and to Mrs. Margaret Dabney, Mr. John White, and Mr. Walter Merz, officers of the Alpha Pi Chapter who made the extensive arrangements necessary for the production of the successful lecture series. It would be remiss not to mention the editor's grateful personal and professional thanks to his colleagues for their participation and to each of the speakers who so generously contributed to the symposium.

Table of Contents

Preface 8

I. Foreign Interpretations and Misinterpretations of American Education: Historical Notes 11
Stewart E. Fraser, Professor of International and Comparative Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville

II. Comprehensions and Apprehensions Concerning American Educational Philosophy 29
Brian Holmes, Reader in Comparative Education, Institute of Education, University of London

III. Discernments Concerning United States Educational Aid to African Nations 41
Franklin Parker, Benedum Professor of Education, West Virginia University, Morgantown

IV. Towards a Study of Comparative Sex Education: Conceptions and Misconceptions 53
Robert M. Bjork, Professor of Economics and Sociology, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville

V. Latin America: Educational Perceptions 73
Harold R. W. Benjamin, Emeritus Professor of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville

Preface

The papers making up this slender volume are the contributions of various researchers, many of whom have devoted a lifetime of study to the understanding and solution of international educational problems. Their scholarly contributions to both research and teaching in the comparative study of education are attested to by their diverse publications and prominence in the field of international education.

The publication of symposium papers is sometimes attendant with various difficulties regarding the central theme of the symposium, its interpretation and the various presentations of the contributors. Accordingly, disparate views are oftentimes gathered together. The very nature of the topic, "Understandings and Misunderstandings," however, is of such an eclectic nature that the range of topics which can be embraced under this rubric allows for a considerable range and a variety of presentations. This is clearly exemplified in the nature and content of the various papers in this collection. The first presentation (by the editor) concerns an analysis of some of the more prominent of nineteenth century commentaries and criticisms made of American education by foreign visitors and educators. It suggests that the published evaluations by foreigners of American education range from the most penetrating to the most naïve of writings.

The analysis of American educational philosophy by a noted British scholar and comparative educator, Brian Holmes, is the result of many years of study and a careful analysis of transatlantic trends in education. The author is a regular and enthusiastic visitor to the United States and has taught and lectured at prominent institutions throughout the country. Accordingly, he knows at first-hand many of the intimate problems which American educational administrators have to face in defining and implementing the diverse and at times conflicting educational goals imposed on them by an articulate and effervescent constituent. Brian Holmes is eminently qualified both to interpret American educational philosophy to his students in Britain and to his colleagues throughout Europe. He does this

with understanding and sympathy and clearly represents the more thoughtful and constructive of foreign critics of the American educational system.

The problems of Africa and the involvement of America in the educational development of various African nations is the subject of Franklin Parker's paper. The author, who knows Africa at first-hand through professional interests developed over several years, is particularly concerned with "educational model borrowing" and the problems of "adoption versus adaption." His paper summarizes some of the main historical developments of United States educational aid to Africa and the problems inherent in the cross-relationships which develop between donor and client nations. It is of interest to compare the efforts of the various former colonial countries, such as Britain and France and the so-called "neo-colonial" newcomers to the scene, namely, the Americans, Russians and the Chinese. The author touches felicitously on a wide range of topics and leaves to the reader the problem of deciding what system of educational priorities needs to be established so that some of the more prominent educational misunderstandings of the past are not repeated.

The topic of sex education and what is being accomplished in school systems throughout the world is the particularly pregnant subject of Robert M. Bjork's interesting presentation. The nature of sex and family education is of such a dimension and it arouses such diverse interest among educators and interested laymen that it is now virtually impossible to generalize regarding the prescription of a suitable course of action which American school administrators can safely follow. The author highlights some of the problems which face educators and sociologists in other nations as they strive to reach the heart of the matter—the population explosion and the need for radical and mature approaches to the imparting of sex education to school children and young adults. The concern for over-population is reflected in Communist China by the political response of the leaders of that nation as they face the problems of a gigantic national population of over 1,000 million by the year 1999. The recent Chinese Communist admonition to Red Guards sent off to the wilderness of Tibet and Sinkiang is crude, simple, and almost counter production—"wallow in the mud," "don't think of love and marriage," "think of Mao and his thoughts." The injunction by Chinese Communist leaders to recalcitrant youth not to make love, but to think righteous thoughts of Mao is practically as bizarre as the

recent Papal encouragement to population inflated families in Latin America to have more "faith and less sex." Robert Bjork indicates a concern with the inability of many governments to face up to their responsibilities in regard to family planning, but he also reserves some of his caustic analysis for targets close to home —the difficulties of the American school to cope with the problems of introducing sex education and more rational and healthy attitudes to it in the public schools.

The last paper in the symposium series concerns Latin America and an analysis of some of her more pressing educational needs. Harold Benjamin and his contributions to the study of comparative education need little introduction. He is well known in Latin America as a sympathetic though at times a devastating critic of educational inequalities as well as perennial American misunderstanding of many Latin American educational problems. Harold Benjamin cautions against overhigh expectations regarding United States educational aid and the efficacy of some of the educational programs of North American universities in Latin America. He notes that the gap is growing wider between United States educational accomplishments on the one hand and what her Latin American neighbors are able to achieve educationally. Computer oriented educational technology has hardly influenced Latin American schools and he believes that they are being left further behind in the world-wide pursuit of a high quality education for the masses. The author, while echoing the general arguments that often permeate discussion of comparative achievements in national education, places the final responsibility on the local people themselves and notes that it is a gross misunderstanding to assume that educators from the United States can play more than an advisory and a consultive role.

Stewart E. Fraser
January, 1969

Peabody International Center
Nashville, Tennessee

CHAPTER I

Foreign Interpretations and Misinterpretations of American Education: Historical Notes*

STEWART E. FRASER

Professor of International and Comparative Education, George Peabody College for Teachers

Nashville, Tennessee

> No one can form a shrewd judgment on American education who merely sees what he is bid to see, and who refrains from employing his critical faculty as well as his organ of admiration. The comparative study of national systems of education is a delicate enterprise. The path to truth lies between Scylla and Charybdis; between harsh, censorious judgments of other people's failings and too ready belief in the superior merits of other people's achievements. But the first requisite for the intelligent study of a foreign system of education is sympathy. We must do as we would be done by.[1]

Most American college students who have survived the early years of undergraduate study have probably read Alexis de Tocqueville's classic *Democracy in America.*

But for every well-known de Tocqueville, there are countless other foreigners who have come to America and whose thoughtful comments on American education have largely passed and gone unnoticed and unremembered. There are those numerous visitors who, since the early 1800's, have come to America, traveled across its diverse countryside and commented on its culture and "peculiar educational attainments." Their accounts, written in both popular journals and learned tomes on "the Americans" continued to intrigue and irritate readers, both domestic and foreign, throughout the nineteenth century. Americans have had a propensity for inviting both critical and laudatory commentary from foreigners, tolerating them for the most part, though sometimes and understandably, becoming disturbed by what has been said of their schools and colleges and of their culture in general.

* Acknowledgement is made to John Wiley and Sons of New York for permission to use this material, portions of which have appeared in the author's *American Education in Foreign Perspectives,* 1969.

Travelers from Europe almost simultaneously with the establishment of the new Republic showed a special interest in the emergence of an "indigenous culture and native schooling" in America. Early nineteenth century British travelers were for the most part patronizing, but still curious concerning their "fractious colonial castoffs," the French were not entirely impartial regarding their somewhat ungrateful allies. Nor were the Germans, Dutch and Scandinavians indifferent to the land which was soon to be of even greater interest for so many of their migrating countrymen in the years to come.

William W. Brickman, distinguished historian of international education, has warned perceptively concerning the reports of foreign visitors that, "naturally, these have to be evaluated on the basis of the criteria of reliability, validity, representativeness, and objectivity." [2] Instead he has suggested that in reality "in view of the youth of education in the United States, there were few historical writings until close to the mid-nineteenth century." [3]

After the end of the Napoleonic Wars, Americans were to be found traveling abroad in increasing numbers chiefly to Western Europe, especially to Britain, France and the German principalities. The names of Benjamin Silliman, John Griscom, Calvin Stowe, Alexander Dallas Bache, William C. Woodbridge and, of course, Horace Mann, are now well known in American educational history as amongst the first successful academic pioneers from the United States venturing into both the international and comparative study of education.

It should not be supposed, however, that Americans unanimously welcomed foreign ideas either imported by foreign commentators or brought back by returning American educators. William C. Woodbridge, an editor of one of America's first educational journals and an extensive traveler in Europe, noted wryly that "we are aware that there is much sensitiveness in our country in regard to foreign improvements—and have received some hints of the danger of exciting it." [4] Accordingly, some limitation must be placed on the efficacy and acceptance within America of "foreign" reports on its educational system. Nonetheless, the travel accounts by Woodbridge and other native Americans were important as they provided valuable information which allowed Americans to be knowledgeable regarding European educational developments.

These visits during the 1850's of Americans to Europe were, however, more than complemented by the many "continentals" traveling in America as seen in the writings of Alexis de Tocqueville in his *De la democratie en Amérique* (1835-1840), Carlo Giuseppe Guglielmo Botta's *Storia della guerra dell 'indipendenza degli Stati Uniti d'America* (1809), Nickolaus Heinrich Julius' *Nordämerikas sittliche Zustände* (1839), Edouard Ducpetiaux's *Des Progrès et de l'état actuel de la réforme pénitentiare et des institutions préventives, aux Etats-Unis, en France, en Suisse, en Angleterre et en Belgique* (1837-1838).[5]

The last-mentioned traveler, Edouard Ducpetiaux, a Belgian prison inspector, in his study of American educational and penal institutions placed in comparative perspective similar studies made of institutions in France, Switzerland, Britain and Belgium. Ducpetiaux's visit to the United States in the 1830's is complemented by a similar visit by George Combe, the Scottish phrenologist and close colleague of Johann Spurzheim. It is interesting to note of Combe's observations concerning American education that he is at once generous in his praise and reserved in his criticisms, noting that "American democracy is a phenomenon which has scarcely had a parallel in the world. It is, therefore, of interest in all its features."[6] But he has also noted perceptively that: "One of the most common errors, in my opinion, committed by foreigners who write about America, as well as by the Americans themselves, is greatly to overestimate the educational attainments of the people."[7]

Combe noted the wage scales for both teachers and day laborers in America and found the former so grossly deficient, especially in the country districts, that he commented: "Probably nineteen-twentieths of the education of children owing to the conditions of most of the common schools is defective in the extreme."[8] His comparisons were with the rural schools of Scotland which he knew so well and to which he was a familiar and regular visitor. Combe often took foreign educators, including Americans, to see them in operation. He noted in respect to American schools that there was a dire need for good normal schools in which to train teachers. He suggested that these institutions should instruct in philosophy and "in the art of training and teaching and they must pay handsomely before they will command good educators."[9] He prophetically warned that Americans, if they could be animated by "enlightened patriotism," should be prepared to accept "large taxation to accomplish this object be-

cause on its fulfillment will depend the future peace and prosperity of their country." [10]

Combe's views are supported for the most part by the noted Swedish educator and politician, P. A. Siljeström, the author of *The Educational Institutions of the United States. Their Character and Organization* (1853).[11] His work represents the first major detailed and analytical work in Swedish on American education. Siljeström, though a critical and careful observer like Combe, was undoubtedly an enthusiast regarding American education. He notes that, "popular education . . . is not only discussed in legislative assembly, but that it forms part of the national life, and is considered an important, nay, the most important concern of the nation, . . . in the depth of American society there are forces at work, which in Europe have as yet produced but very mediocre results." [12]

These laudatory views were being offered at the precise time that American educators in increasing numbers were also traveling across the Atlantic to seek new models for elementary and grammar schools as well as for teacher training "normal" institutions. A continuous interest by peripatetic American scholars in higher education was maintained in European universities throughout the nineteenth century but it was not until the termination of the American Civil War that this interest was manifest in any major fashion.

The period 1820 to 1850 saw many prominent American educators depart for Europe to observe, compare, and learn. This was perhaps America's great initial period of "international borrowing" as practiced by her scholars and schoolmen. Yet during this very period of borrowing and foreign comparisons, the American "common" school was itself fast becoming a favorite topic of interest for many of the European visitors either from Britain or the continent. And, as the Swede Siljeström noted in explanation, because education is the "most powerful means and the highest end that can be proposed for national activity . . . it is particularly discernible that the system of popular schools in America should be known and studied in Europe." [13]

The views of Siljeström exemplifying an approving Scandinavian viewpoint can be equally offset by the pessimistic and critical analysis of Israel Joseph Benjamin. The peripatetic self-made scholar from Hungary visited the United States in 1859 and was not prepared to view American education sanguinely.

Benjamin, though not unsympathetic to the problems of a developing nation, was not prepared to overlook the many educational inadequacies which he clearly saw in comparative perspective. He says of American schools:

> First of all, the claim to be the most enlightened of peoples is a kind of self-deception. In this land there is not a single seat of learning that could be compared with such minor universities as those of Padua, Jena, Gottingen, or Halle, to say nothing of the great institutions in England, France, in Berlin, St. Petersburg and Vienna. This is one of the most certain criteria of learning. Enlightenment is not a plant that grows of itself, that springs spontaneously from the soil without care and attention; it is rather a blossom that never unfolds without the supporting hands of man.
>
> From what sources could exceptionally enlightened principles, practices, or doctrines have been fashioned here? Like electricity, enlightenment must have conductors to spread broadly through the community; the best conductors are the schools and the press. The American public schools are scarcely two decades old and still suffer from the deficiencies which normally retard new institutions. The shallowness of the colleges, academies and seminaries is commonly known. Young ladies study astronomy before they know how to spell properly; young men attain the doctorate after they rush through a mixed-up mass of Greek, Latin, mathematics, French, German, natural philosophy, chemistry, history, geography, logic, mental and moral philosophy, and still other subjects, in two or three years without ever having mastered one of them. Tailors, shoemakers, farmers, shop assistants become physicians in thirty-two weeks; policemen, watchmen, constables all of a sudden become attorneys. Any man who feels in himself the capacity for becoming a preacher, teacher, politician, statesman, or diplomat soon finds himself a sphere of activity. The whole ridiculous superficiality is yet not by far so clumsy and disgusting as the pedantry of the half-educated teachers and pedagogues who kill the spirit with words and formulae. Can we then see here a soil to nurture the most enlightened of people? The schools are still too young and the colleges too immature.[14]

The interest of foreigners in American education around the mid-century was certainly not only confined to European observers and travelers. The names of Jose Pedro Varela of Uruguay and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento of Argentina are recorded as interested spectators of the American scene. They have at last become familiar and part of the history of both American education and international education. Their adulatory reports of the 1860's concerning the American institutions they visited have been noted and are now part of the documentary record of Latin American visitors to the United States. Their useful comparative writings on American education are even preceded by another Latin American writer of the 1820's who has gone largely un-

noticed, Lorenzo de Zavala, a prominent statesman from Yucatan, Mexico, who wished for his countrymen the benefits of the American common school.

The democratic and popular nature of American education, the efficacy if not the efficiency of her common schools, the localized control and the decentralized nature of educational administration all attracted the attention of foreign visitors. These are perhaps the more positive aspects of American education as noted by travelers during the early part of the nineteenth century, but similar topics of interest and euphemistic remarks have been reiterated by travelers throughout the nineteenth century and well into the next. In all, for over 150 years, it is possible to note that certain characteristics of American education have evidently remained constant and have repeatedly drawn the attention and consistent reportage by foreign educators.

Henry T. Tuckerman, writing a century ago about "America and her commentators," noted that the country is "one about which the truth has been more generalized and less discriminated." [15] And he also suggested that America was a "land whose inhabitants were so uniformly judged *en masse*." [16] There were thousands of educated foreigners, both literate men and intelligent women, who visited America during the nineteenth century. Some of these came to settle eventually and contribute materially to their new homeland, while others traveled across the country, principally to gather travel anecdotes and intelligence for prospective immigrants. They also contributed to the wealth of commentary on the natural resources of the continent, the cultural needs of its people and the education of her children. Frances Trollope, Charles Dickens, Frederick Marryat, and Harriet Martineau are among the more distinguished and publicized of British travelers who came to America. Dickens, who was no particular friend of the American press, had a warm personal regard for the academics and intellectuals with whom he met, noting that "an educated American" was "the most endearing and most generous of friends." [17] He was one of the sharpest of nineteenth century European critics to visit America, yet could find only praise for American colleges, believing that "they disseminate no prejudices; rear no bigots . . . and above all, in their whole course of study and instruction recognize a world . . . beyond the college walls." [18]

In the 1860's, at the same time that Henry Tuckerman was compiling his pioneer work on "foreign commentators," a dis-

tinguished English Episcopal churchman, Bishop James Fraser, was traveling and inspecting both United States and Canadian schools.[19] His comparison of educational developments in North America when contrasted with conditions prevailing in England led him to note enthusiastically of the American school that it was truly a microcosm of American life. This he characterized as a system which contained both "elements of strength and weakness, of success and failure." Bishop Fraser saw that American education was dynamic, evolutionary and pragmatic, but he was also highly critical that the excessive "spirit of freedom and equality" left little time for "work to be thoroughly well done." High, excessive ambition with its peculiar American concomitants or "sensitiveness to praise and blame," was a debilitating feature of education productive of an "excessive and exhausting strain on the mental and physical powers." The American school reflected so many different values and contained the ideals of such a fast developing heterogeneous population that Fraser was eventually forced to admit that he found it difficult, if not impossible, to stamp the system with any educational epithet by which to characterize the whole nation.

His analysis of American society and education represents perhaps the best example of balanced criticism offered by a foreigner during the entire century. Fraser's evaluation of American education and its applicability, or otherwise, to English education can be seen through the considerable influence his report later had on educational reform in his own country. The extensive quotation below from his 1866 report on North American education exemplifies best the perspicacity of a sympathetic but critical observer.

> In endeavoring to comprehend and appreciate this system of common or public schools—for the two epithets are used indifferently—it is absolutely necessary that the European observer should throw his mind, if possible, into the conditions of American life, should take his point of departure from a few leading social principles, and keep constantly before his eyes certain salient social phenomena, which have (so to speak) necessitated its form, give to it its significance, underlie its action, maintain its motive power, determine its methods, and fix its aims. The principles have been already referred to; they are the principles of perfect social equality and absolute religious freedom. The phenomena are the restlessness and activity of the American character—without, perhaps, the culture and refinement of the old Athenian, but with all his versatility—the absorbing interest of political life; the constantly rising aims of each individual; the ebb and flow of commercial enterprise, and the immense development of the spirit of speculation; the intense energy of the na-

tional temperament, its rapidity of movement, its precipitancy, its impatience of standing still. Many an American in the course of an active life will have turned his hand to half a dozen different professions or ways of getting a livelihood. "The one lesson we are taught all through life," a person one day humorously but truly said to me, "is to be discontented with our station."

And it is this temper more than any other, intensified by the opportunities that the country affords and the prizes that it holds out to enterprise and ability, which is the motive power that sustains the schools. Corresponding, therefore, with these ideas, and reflecting these phenomena, must be the proper system of education. And the correspondence is marvellously exact, the reflection wonderfully true. The American school is a microcosm of American life. There reigns in it the same spirit of freedom and equality; the same rapidity of movement, scarce leaving time for work to be thoroughly well done; the same desire of progress, eagerly catching at every new idea, ever on the lookout for improvements; the same appeals to ambition, the same sensitiveness to praise and blame, the same subordination of the individual to the mass, of the scholar to the class, as of the citizen to the nation; the same prominence given to pursuits of a utilitarian, over pursuits of a refining, aim; the same excessive and exhausting strain on the mental and physical powers; the same feverishness and absence of repose;—elements of strength and weakness, of success and failure, mingled together in proportions which make it almost impossible to find any one discriminating epithet by which to characterize the resultant whole.[20]

Bishop Fraser's observations were for the most part highly laudatory and still accurately reflected the views expressed twenty years earlier by a fellow countryman, Robert Dale Owen, who indicated to Congress in 1846 that a desire for education—a goal for knowledge—must be gauged to reach not only "scholars and students . . . but the minds and hearts of the masses." Owen's words fell on a fertile audience and Fraser, two decades later, was able to note specifically the considerable contribution of America's more prominent educational reformers such as Henry Barnard, Calvin Stowe and Calvin Wiley, all of whom were able to persuade state legislators to follow the educational example originally set in Massachusetts.

Briefly in evaluating the travelers, particularly those from Britain, it can be said on balance that schools and educational developments in America generally were regarded with great interest if not with considerable sympathy. But the travelers, prior to the Civil War, particularly those whose views have been popularly publicized were, for the most part, thoughtful, critical, but often only well-educated tourists rather than professional educators with comparative interests and skills.

The post Civil War period was clearly distinguished from the fifty years preceding it by the greater range academically and higher professional status and standards of foreign observers. The Civil War, the principles involved, the educational need for reconstruction, Negro emancipation and the Freedman's Bureau, all were in part responsible for adding to the interest of European, Latin American and, later, Asian educators in visiting America.

The United States, prior to the Civil War, was an educational curiosity for many of the short-term visitors, and the country represented a culturally barren desert; but the immigration Mecca provided by the United States, through the opening of the West, continued to draw both capital and migrants and certainly both the curious and desperate from Europe. In addition, the next thirty years to the turn of the century saw some several thousand Americans become foreign students in European institutions. Their presence could not but also add to the curiosity towards the United States of German, French and British scholars and intellectuals with whom the Americans came in contact.

The fast developing foreign interest in American education after the Civil War is noticed in a variety of European publications. This is manifest, for example, in Sophia V. Blake's *A Visit to Some American Schools and Colleges,* 1867, an excellent account of women's education as it was then developing; in Celestin Hippeau's *L'instruction publique aux États-Unis,* published in 1870, concerning elementary and secondary schools; F. Migerka's *Das Unterrichtswesen in den Vereinigten Staaten,* 1877, a report on the Philadelphia World Exposition, containing critical evaluations of American schools prepared for the Austrian Ministry of Education; Leon Donnat's *L'état de Californie: Première partie, l'éducation publique, la presse, le mouvement intellectuel,* 1878, containing a detailed account backed by careful research of Californian schools and cultural institutions; Marie-Casimir Landreyt's *L'instruction publique en France et les écoles Américaines,* c. 1883, described by G. Stanley Hall as "light, but readable notes of travel by a lady" on primary, secondary, higher and professional education; Athanasius Zimmermann, S. J., *Die Universitäten in den Vereinigten Staaten Amerikas: Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte,* 1896, a Catholic scholar's study of higher education in the United States with special attention to religious education and schooling.

But in spite of the proliferation of post Civil War publications by foreigners of American education partially exemplified by the authors noted above,[21] there were few that exhibited a distinctive research methodology or evidence of a systematic study of American education in a fuller comparative perspective. The principal exception to this tendency can best be noted in a New Zealander, R. Laishley, who in 1886 set forth in tabular and contrasting form the structure of American educational administration, curricula and organization in both international and comparative perspectives. In his *schema* America is set down in sharp contrast with the leading European nations and Laishley's careful notes on America represent one of the best systematic comparative reviews and presentations of international educational systems effected during the whole century. Education is carefully dissected into its various component parts and presented in a useful tabular reference form. Laishley's work was intended primarily for his colleagues back home in Auckland, but it represents with its copious supplementary footnotes one of the most detailed analyses and carefully substantiated comparative studies of education of the "most and advanced nations of the time." [22]

During the nineteenth century, the study and practice of comparative education developed along a variety of paths whose more accurate delineation had taken the full century to clarify. The growing quest for higher and more universal education and a conscious need for educational reform was in part responsible for the curiosity regarding education in "foreign" countries. The multitude of foreign writings during the century, both by interested travelers and professional educators, testify to a developing interest in American education and the central role it has played in the political and economic development of America. Some of these writings have been already briefly referred to above; but they are merely a limited sample of the diverse material available by the end of the nineteenth century to the student of foreign and comparative education. By 1900, America had conquered her West and developed an industrial power which was soon to put out its first challenges to the industrial leadership of Europe. The country had proved a home and haven for millions of European immigrants who were, through their children and the public school, to be imperceptibly absorbed into American society.

This early role of American education in international and intercultural education was expressed poignantly by the distin-

guished English educator, Michael Sadler, who noted that the immigrants were the raw materials of American democracy. And he suggested that "the school is the mill which grinds up these diverse materials into one consistence." [23] The presence of a growing number of American educators abroad, scholars and missionaries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the American post-graduate student in Germany and France evidenced the fast growing international exchange aspects of American education. International expositions, the developing interests of the United States Bureau of Education, foreign officials and school delegations visiting the United States all contributed to attracting a growing and more professional group of observers to the United States, especially after the Civil Wa[illegible].

The professional foreign commentators on American education, prior to 1860, were few and far between and, for the most part, of modest distinction. But the last decades of the century saw teams of distinguished foreign educators come both on private visits and as members of official delegations visiting American schools and colleges. This would include German visitors and their accounts such as Rudolf Dulon, *Aus Amerika über Schule, Deutsche Schule, Amerikanische Schule, und Deutsche-amerikanische Schule,* 1866; and Emil Hausknecht, *Amerikanisches Bildungswesen,* 1894; the writings of British authors, Amy Bramwell and Millicent Hughes, *Training of Teachers in the United States,* 1894; Sara Burstall, *Education of Girls in the United States,* 1894; David Salmon, *Some Impressions of American Education,* 1899; the Canadian account by Egerton Ryerson, *Special Report on the Popular Education of Europe and the United States of America,* 1868; the Australian comparisons by W. C. Grasby, *Teaching in Three Continents,* 1891; the distinguished French commentators would include F. E. Buisson, *Rapport sur l'instruction primaire à l'Exposition Universal de Philadelphie en 1876;* Marie Loizillon, *L'éducation des enfants aux États-Unis,* 1883; Paul Bourget, *Outre-mer Impressions of America,* 1895; and the many reports of Gabriel Compayré, particularly those written during the period 1893-1900 including, for example, his *L'enseignment secondaire aux États-Unis,* 1896.

The modest rustic schools of America of the early 1800's were a far cry from the fast-developing system of public schools, both primary and secondary, seen in operation by 1900. By then, the unique American contribution, the universal public common school, was firmly established in American society and the public

comprehensive high school for all was in process of rapid development. By the turn of the century, there was enough of the high school structure visible to capture the imagination of the foreign visitor. There was always, however, the "obviously successful rather than the obviously profound" which had the greatest claim for the admiration of the average American citizen. But the foreign observer could not but note that the creation of the United States and its emerging educational institutions had been subjected to a wider and more strenuous range of pressures than any other nation, particularly those of Europe. He noted the peculiar situation of the United States as the melting pot nation with so many diffusive and divisive segments in her social and political makeup.

The thoughtful, though critical, commentator came to realize slowly that by the turn of the century American education had several clearly identifiable "aims" all of which, if understood sympathetically, would negate all but the most rabid and irrational of foreign criticisms. For the foreigner the four bases upon which American education was predicated in 1900 were: (i) the understanding that a self-governing people must be fully educated; (ii) each individual must be given the fullest opportunity for self-improvement and advancement; (iii) education was to be the prime vehicle for the assimilation of immigrants and the foreign-born; (iv) a rigid caste system either hereditary, political or economic must be prevented or continually modified through a system of free public and compulsory education for all. It was in fact, a French critic, Christopher Langlois, who noted these four fundamentals and he accurately summarizes and repeats the similar evaluations made previously by many other commentators who visited America at the turn of the century.[24] If an understanding of these four principal goals of American education is evident in foreign commentaries then it may be presumed that at least their criticisms have been tempered by some understanding of the special historical, political and economic problems which beset American schools during the formative years prior to the twentieth century.

By the turn of the century American education had developed certain distinctive characteristics and specific peculiarities upon which foreign commentators commented almost uniformly and generally. By 1900 the American elementary public or "common" school was recognized as a major and noteworthy force in the assimilation of immigrant children though its critics suggested

that it only afforded a modest educational base composed of "fundamentals" plus some "civics and patriotic studies." The free, public and compulsory aspects of American education, while they did not then extend greatly beyond the elementary level, at least provided a significant basis for integrating Americans of all classes and economic backgrounds. The public school, for all classes, for most religions and for "some races" was an established fact. The high school was in the process of being universalized, and the concept of a compulsory secondary education for all those who could utilize it up to their mid-teens was soon to become a new but important characteristic of American education. The avenue to higher education, while difficult to traverse, was possible for many American secondary school graduates. Although in 1900 barely five per cent were able to go on to college for obvio s reasons of financial and family responsibilities, alternative opportunities for "further education" were being pioneered well before the First World War.

The picture that the foreigner formed of the unlimited opportunities in American economic and political life was paralleled with what he believed to be the considerable opportunities Americans had for receiving a complete higher education unimpaired by discriminatory, caste-like and selective schools such as those he saw in Europe. The American system of higher education provided for "further training"—some of a professional nature and much of a vocational nature. But it still could not afford entirely the luxury of a "higher education" for all who desired it—and it was for another half century to pass before this dream could be closer to fulfilment. The European observer, on the other hand, knew full well that a university training was for both aesthetic and practical purposes related to the professions, especially the distinguished professions such as law and medicine, as well as for developing an intellectual and literary upper class. Hence, higher education for the European had distinctively mixed utilitarian and professional, as well as aesthetic and class, reasons for its being, though for reasons which were distinctively different in comparison with the practical bent that could be found as justification for the universities of the United States.

The ideals, goals and aspirations of many nations are for some observers more obviously reflected in the schools. The widespread availability of education, the degree of social and educational mobility, public involvement and even the curricula and textbooks, all reveal something of a nation's cultural and educational

levels whether determined by economic, political or religious considerations. An analysis of the presence of civic and moral education, the absence of religious observances, the streaming and selectivity of the pupils and the availability of higher education may give sufficient indication as to the kind of society in which the school is located and may allow for an evaluation of the relative role it plays and the importance it holds. Thus, it is particularly important for the foreigner to observe, understand and evaluate carefully and accurately American ideals in education, both on an American "national" basis, as well as on an "international-comparative" basis.

A misinterpretation of these national goals or a prejudice against them may often mar an evaluation of the importance of what is really going on within the classroom. But the foreigner should be sympathized with in his attempt to equate and evaluate comparatively an all-Negro school in Biloxi, Mississippi, and its erstwhile racial counterpart in Harlem, New York. Likewise, the education of a Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican in New York will not necessarily and uniformly show exact correlation with the quality of schooling that a Spanish-speaking student of Mexican background will receive in Los Angeles.

The diversity of American education, the disparate communities that it serves and the apparently over-embracing goals which the schools must espouse are such that perhaps only a Soviet educator, who well knows the polycultural background of his own country, could understand. The Russian also knows full well the diversity in language, religion, race, and geography as contributing factors affecting the fullest coordination of national educational goals. Even within Britain the goals of Scottish education do not entirely or necessarily coincide with those of Wales or Northern Ireland, far less with those of England. The diversity of aims of schools in Dublin, Eire, and those in Belfast, Northern Ireland, though but 100 miles apart, are attested to through diverging goals based on religious and political differences, whose origins are several centuries old.

Thus, it is an interesting intellectual exercise to ask the foreign observer to define what he thinks are the "principal goals in American education." This is a question that Americans, particularly today, are increasingly asking themselves; though their communality of goals was theoretically assured 150 years ago and supposedly there was considerable consensus but 50 years ago! Today, there is an ever increasing multiplicity of answers and

certainly diversity when the subject of American educational goals are discussed. And yet, amid the utmost variety immediately apparent, there are certain fundamentals which still appear to have persisted during the past 150 years and which indubitably form a philosophical core to which most Americans can and will generally accede. They basically concern the need of the school at the elementary level to teach a specific number, though gradually increasing range, of fundamental skills. These goals are then enunciated at the secondary level as the upbringing of young men and women with a variety of intellectual skills and manual dexterities needed to obtain both financially and socially satisfying employment. Because the United States is at once a democracy and a pluralistic society it is important for all its citizens that equality of educational opportunity be translated into factual non-discriminatory terms.

The school in America as a common denominator has necessitated the involvement of the widest range of talents, skills, and aspirations. Unfortunately, as many foreigners quickly note, the school in spite of all its promises cannot guarantee that individual aspirations can be properly satisfied or even partially achieved where there is a definite lack of talent or what is now so prosaically termed a minimal "achievement potential." The frustrations of society for children during and after school hours are such that many of the formal processes of learning are immediately or partially negated, disrupted, or diverted into antisocial channels. The decided concern with democratic institutions in America over a century ago led de Tocqueville to remark on this country's pronounced tendency towards *mediocrity*. The educational situation today would undoubtedly lead him to comment on the new tendency towards *meritocracy*, or perhaps on a graduated system of *mediocrity*, which contains its own plateaus of achievement, and allows American youth to make the most of their educational opportunities but permits various levels of mediocre though socially accepted achievement plateaus. In de Tocqueville's time, the apparent endless economic opportunities available to the energetic American led him to believe that the "all-rounded person," a mediocre citizen rather than a "superlative" specialist, was a decisive force in allowing Americans to obtain but only modest returns from their schools. Today, de Tocqueville would find that the benefits from schooling, particularly high school diplomas and college degrees, have a

specific cash value and are indispensable in the economic and social ratings that come with the new "meritocracy."

De Tocqueville, in his time, would also have argued that America, though a land of inventors, could not produce "great scholars, poets, artists, or authors." The early nineteenth century observer would suggest that where practical utility was important, Americans could excel, but where "meditation and 'the pursuit' of truth for its own sake" predominates, Americans are unsuccessful. This viewpoint which labels Americans as a practical people, but devoid of sensibilities for the contemplative, to some extent still permeates foreign commentary on much of American education, particularly higher education. But the intervening century since de Tocqueville wrote has seen Americans become deeply involved in the development of aesthetic education, the endowment of the performing arts, and successful endeavors to integrate humanistic and scientific studies in the general education of both her high school students and those enrolled in college.

The endowment of education, particularly higher education, through either legislative appropriations, state and local grants, as well as by the private philanthropic foundations at least attest to the foreigner that Americans were and still are more than ever prepared to look on education as a form of both personal and national investment.

In 1900 the German educator, A. Wallage, notes, for example, that Americans "gladly pay right large costs and without a murmur give to education more than any other country in the world . . . it is in general a striking characteristic of the American people to appropriate splendid sums of money for the erection and maintenance of schoolhouses and equipment." [25]

It seems appropriate in conclusion to note the thoughtful *caveat* of R. E. Hughes concerning the proper evaluation of "foreign systems of education." Hughes, a prominent English educator, made a special study of American education and placed it clearly in comparative perspective. Not only was his evaluative warning uttered in 1900 perceptive then, but his vision of the future course and limitations of comparative and international studies in education were also controversial. He noted:

> Each system of education can only be understood when seen in its own setting. Each is an expression of its nation's genius; it is characteristic of its people. In so far as it is thriving it is truly popular, and only so far as it is popular and peculiar is it national. The "habitat" of each system

is fixed, it is an indigenous product; consequently it is not only unscientific, but it is impossible to measure comprehensively any system of national education in terms of another. These systems cannot be arranged in order of merit. The finer elements, the more ethical and spiritual factors in national culture, defy the balance of the analyst and the scalpel of the anatomist; they are susceptible to no quantitative tests.

Thus the whole drift of our investigations points to this one main conclusion: every country has, in the main, that system of training best adapted to its present needs, and most capable of developing in such a way as to meet future national needs.

Although, however, each system is, as we have said, characteristic, yet they all reveal certain general tendencies which show unmistakably the growth of world-citizenship that is going on over the globe.[26]

---

[1] Michael Sadler, 1902, addressing Scottish teachers on his "Impressions of American Education," in *Educational Review*, Vol. 25 (March, 1903), pp. 218-219.

[2] William W. Brickman, "An Historical Survey of Foreign Writings on American Educational History," *Paedagogica Historica*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1962, p. 6.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] William C. Woodbridge (editor), *American Annals of Education and Instruction*, Vol. I (June, 1831), pp. 243-244.

[5] For a documentary presentation of the nineteenth century American involvement in transatlantic educational exchanges, see Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, *A History of International and Comparative Education: Nineteenth Century Documents* (Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1968).

[6] George Combe, *Notes on the United States of America during a Phrenological Visit in 1838-39-40* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1841), p. xi.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

[11] Published originally in 1852, in Stockholm as *Resa i Förenta Staterna*, 2 vols., Vol. I, *Om bildningen i Förenta Staterna* was translated into English by Frederica Rowan and published in London by John Chapman, 1853.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. v.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. vii.

[14] See Fraser and Brickman, *op. cit.*, pp. 329, 330.

[15] Henry T. Tuckerman, *America and Her Commentators with a Critical Sketch of Travel in the United States* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1864), pp. 444.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Charles Dickens, *American Notes, Vol. XXVII, The Works of Charles Dickens* (New York: Peter Fendon Collier, n.d.), p. 284.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

[19] James Fraser, *Report on the Common School Systems of the United States and the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada*, Vol. II of the School Inquiry Commissions, 1866, see also the *American Journal of Education* (Henry Barnard, editor), National Series, Vol. III, 1870, p. 578.

[20] See Fraser and Brickman, *op. cit.*, pp. 333, 334.

[21] I am indebted to W. W. Brickman for initially drawing my attention to many of these references.

[22] See R. Laishley, *Report on State Education in Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, Belgium, and the United States* (Wellington, New Zealand: 1886).

[23] Sadler, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

[24] See Christopher V. Langlois, "Notes sur l'Éducation aux États-Unis," *Revue Internationale de L'énseignement*, No. 49, 1905, pp. 289-309.

[25] A. Wallage, "Ein Nordamerikanisches Lehrerseminar," *Deutsche Zeitsschrift für Ausländisches Unterrichtswesen*, No. 6 (1900), p. 106.

[26] R. E. Hughes, *The Making of Citizens: A Study in Comparative Education* (London: The Walter Scott Publishing Company Ltd., 1902), p. 387.

CHAPTER II

Comprehensions and Apprehensions Concerning American Educational Philosophy

BRIAN HOLMES

Reader in Comparative Education,
Institute of Education, University of London

Twelve years ago in the Boyd H. Bode Memorial Lectures which I had the honor to deliver at Ohio State University I asked American critics of American education to provide a rationale for the practical proposals they were then making to reform the school curriculum. I wondered whether they were able to justify a curriculum centered round selected subjects or disciplines without returning to a neo-liberal arts theory of curriculum of the kind held by Aristotle and succeeding generations of European educators. I doubted very much whether such a theory of acceptable basic and unacceptable non-basic disciplines would meet the needs of American schools.

I doubt whether A. E. Bestor, A. Lynd, Hilda Neatby, Robert M. Hutchins, and other critics to whom I referred took up the challenge. Nor am I immodest enough to think that *American Criticism of American Education* sparked off a spate of discussion in England about curriculum reform. Certainly in the last ten years English and American philosophers of education have analyzed in considerable detail terms such as *field of study, area of study,* and how these differ from a *discipline.* One outcome of this philosophical discussion implies that practical curriculum reform can be based on choices made from a number of logically related disciplines. Those subjects which have been taught in school for many years but which under this critical analysis do not meet the criteria of the basic disciplines, may under pressure for time in the school year be rejected. These forms are obviously important if the position held by Bestor and others is examined.

This philosophizing, using the refined tools of analysis has been made, it should be noted, from the basis of a particular frame of

reference which if not strictly Aristotelian is nevertheless European. The frame of reference itself determines the kinds of questions philosophers of education have asked and the kinds of terms they have chosen to subject to critical analysis. In other words conceptual analysis has, in many cases, not made any more explicit than the critics of American education have done the set of assumptions from which analysis is launched. It has not been adequately matched by processes of synthesis.

Conceptual and linguistic techniques are without question important and in need of development. The schoolmen, committed broadly to an Aristotelian logic, debated endlessly. But, as Bertrand Russell has said, modern logic had to advance in the teeth of opposition from those who held that the syllogism was the basis of logical disputation. Yet while there is constant need to refine the techniques of philosophical disputation there is also needed a clarification of the systems of philosophy without which techniques are no more valuable than the metre rule, or the swinging pendulum, or a pound of platinum are to the physical sciences. Refinements of technique carried Newtonian science to the edge of theoretical breakdown in the late nineteenth century. A new cosmology was needed before science could again make a major leap forward.

My request today therefore is that American philosophers of education continue to search for a new rationale for American education. Success would mean that a new system of philosophy would evolve to give general answers to the main philosophical questions and to major socio-political issues of the day. There is need in other words for serious normative studies which will help professional educationists and laymen to decide what "ought to be the case" and to know possible alternatives to any consensual normative position. Lawrence A. Cremin's attempt in *The Genius of American Education* to find a new rationale for American education no doubt failed, but the question he asked was of fundamental importance and should be pursued with vigor. Such a claim should not be interpreted to mean that when new assumptions answering major questions are put forward, critical analyses of them are not needed. The process of testing new ideas needs to go on, and indeed may be of greater educational and social value than the present somewhat exclusive interest in the analysis of familiar terms in education.

There are two main reasons why this approach to philosophizing in education has become urgently needed. The first reason is

that Europeans have had to depend heavily on American writers for an educational theory which will make it possible for them to make sense of practical reforms. The applied philosophy of Harry S. Broudy, Joe Burnett, B. O. Smith, Hilda Taba and Ralph Tyler, to mention a few, in the field of curriculum reform is symptomatic of this dependence. Present moves in curriculum change in England today, indeed, remind me of much of the work which was being done in the U.S.A. during the 1930's. Even a superficial analysis of some new English Certificate of Secondary Education syllabuses with some of the proposals put forward by schools engaged in the *Eight Year Study* would justify a more careful comparative investigation of the source of English curriculum theories for the less academically inclined school child.

The changing European curriculum is only one of many institutions which are in process of reform. Under the impact of industrialization, the growth of new aspirations, and the expansion of numbers many educational institutions are undergoing reform. In many cases American prototypes provide the basis of institutional innovation. The organization of the second stage of education, the development of new types of teacher education and the structure of higher education are areas in which the influence of American innovations during the period 1920 to 1950 are being felt, particularly in England. There is no doubt also, for example, that French educationists responsible for the Langevin-Wallon reform proposals immediately after World War Two were influenced by the progressive education movement. Again the interchange of Dewey's ideas with those of English educationists such as Margaret and Rachel McMillan and J. J. Findlay could no doubt be documented. This community of outlook was shared by progressive educators throughout Europe.

What Europeans need today is a new rationale which will enable them to run comprehensive schools, *écoles uniques,* and *einheitschulen.* Unfortunately there is evidence to show that American philosophers of education have not made pragmatism acceptable to many European educationists. In the field of Comparative Education, for example, Friedrich Schneider's constant reference to the inadequacy of Anglo-Saxon pragmatism serves to make the point. The reliance in East European and Soviet literature on the main theories of social change advanced by Marx in seeking to develop comparative studies is somewhat modified now by a willingness to investigate functional relationships in various educational systems in a more pragmatic manner than

was the case a few years ago. Russell's reference to Dewey as an apologist of American commercialism is symptomatic of the view taken by many European philosophers of the materialistic philosophy of the U.S.A. Yet, at the same time, there is a tendency to regard all Americans as pragmatists, whether they be followers of recognized spokesmen of the tradition such as Peirce, James or Dewey, or whether they be neo-Thomists, existentialists, perennialists or neo-classicists. In other words, Americans are thought to hold to certain assumptions about the nature of knowledge, the characteristics of the desirable society and the qualities of individuality which place them in a particular, and in most respects different, category or framework of thought from those which prevail in Europe. Parenthetically European philosophers of education sometimes consider the conceptual analysis by Americans of terms such as "activity," "creativity" and "democracy" as less than adequate.

The second main reason why attention should be given to the creation of a new rationale is because since the Second World War American institutions have been in the process of subtle but radical change. In addition, the conditions under which they have had to operate have changed considerably. Among the important innovations are the programs supported by the 1958 NDEA Act, the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the 1966 International Education Act; not to mention those which followed the 1954 Supreme Court ruling on segregated schools. The new wealth of America stands out as one of the very significant new conditions, but perhaps the most important of all is the country's involvement in world affairs. The center of the world stage is occupied by the U.S.A. Its political, economic and cultural policies are followed by most Europeans with the closest attention. Polarization of reaction towards these policies is inevitable. Negative responses can, no doubt, be explained as due to a misunderstanding of America's motives and objectives. At the same time it is possible that concepts appropriate to the welfare society and the new frontier need to be worked out with care. A new theory of internationalism for Americans may well be in process of formulation. The present debates about Vietnam suggest the quest for it has begun. They reflect a more fundamental concern for a system of philosophy which will help Americans to decide what they ought to do—whether to commit themselves more deeply in world affairs or withdraw to a pre-war isolationism; whether to pay more attention to qualities of leadership than to skills of

mass participation; whether to promote the gifted or provide massive aid to the underprivileged and disadvantaged.

In goal orientated pluralistic societies analytical philosophy alone cannot provide answers to these and other major questions. Normative studies are needed too. The objective of such studies should be to discover a new, or to reformulate an old, system of philosophy which will serve to provide guidelines for action. Will an up-dated pragmatism suffice for America? Or are any of the traditional or up-dated European philosophies suitable? The search for alternatives among American philosophers of education seems to me to lack important comparative dimensions. At present, due no doubt to the need for survey courses and appropriate textbooks in philosophy of education, it seems to be leading to a confused eclecticism. Idealism, existentialism and materialism have within them several schools of thought. The great European idealist philosophers and their assumptions can be identified, so can the materialists and the more recent existentialists. But it is also necessary to make clear the national characteristics of these philosophies. When speaking of idealism, for example, are we referring to Descartes' system which is now peculiarly French, based as it is on a belief in the ability of individuals to think for themselves and reach certainty through such logical thinking? Or is it an Hegelian form of idealism which has, and does, appeal to the West Germans? Hegelianism postulates absolutes which transcend men but towards the achievement of which men should strive. How different from this form of idealism is the idealism of Englishmen who have been influenced by Locke and Berkeley? And again Marx and Lenin provide an absolutist framework which enables us to make sense of Soviet materialism but which is in many important respects very different from the absolutism of German idealism.

The importance of recognizing that these systems of philosophy are reflected in national systems of education lies in the relationships which exist between theory and practice. While it would certainly be foolish to assert that there is a one to one relationship between ideology and educational policy and practice, nevertheless systems of philosophy do influence the work of teachers and give to it a particular national flavor. Rarely is it possible to criticize educational practice without calling into account some aspects of the theory behind it. To hope that undesirable foreign practices can be avoided in spite of the fact that the theoretical foundations of them are accepted is a dangerous illusion.

Whether traditional systems of philosophy can be so improved as to serve the needs of America in the mid-twentieth century and subsequently is doubtful. Yet philosophers of education need a coherent, consistent system of philosophy. Confused eclecticism places them at a technical disadvantage. The practical implications of accepting a consistent form of European idealism, materialism or existentialism may be unacceptable. Finally, the search for a non-American alternative may lead to failure on the part of professional colleagues and laymen to appreciate, let alone accept, the philosophizing of academic philosophers.

The international dimension of America's role today probably makes it necessary for philosophers to look seriously at non-Western systems of thought. Buddhism, for example, influences much of what goes on in education in Ceylon. Other forms of Buddhism can be applied to education in Japan. Islam, with its sectarian differences, circumscribes debates about education in many countries. There is need to reveal through philosophical analysis the major differences between these systems and those of Europe and North America. I have pointed out elsewhere that theoretical or rational constructs, based on philosophical forms of inquiry would help comparative educationists to establish bench marks for the comparison of value systems. Such constructs would be complementary to those prepared on the basis of empirical techniques—questionnaires, attitude tests and the like.

In short the comparative dimension of the philosopher of education's work is becoming increasingly important in face of America's world commitment. The assumptions of his own system should be examined carefully and compared with the assumptions of a system of philosophy which may be regarded as representative of a selected foreign country. Unless he adopts a philosophical position from which to use the tools of analysis the analysis itself will be sterile. If the position or cluster of theories he accepts is itself sterile or inappropriate to the conditions of the day then the value of critical analysis will be very strictly limited. The contexts of analysis should therefore be (a) logically consistent within a philosophical system, (b) sociologically appropriate and (c) capable of international-comparative application. For example, what does democracy mean to a French Cartesian? Or to a follower of Condorcet? What does equality mean to a British empiricist or follower of Locke and J. S. Mill? What meaning can be given to the Japanese concept of charisma?

Needed today are philosophers who will break the bonds of technique and move into the field of speculation in search of new answers to philosophical and socio-political questions. The need is as great, if not greater, than that which faced the early pragmatist in the late nineteenth century. Then according to Philip Wiener in *The Evolution of Pragmatism* men such as Chauncy Wright, William James, Oliver Wendell Holmes, John Fiske and George Mead attempted in a rapidly changing world to make sense of the assumptions which were informing their own professional work. One of them found in pragmatism a rationale for law, another for medicine and Dewey attempted to provide one for education. Is a new pragmatism needed? Or are today's problems such that an entirely new set of assumptions are needed if in the future Americans are to have a system of philosophy to which, in face of difficult problems and decisions, they can turn with some confidence for guidance?

Another task is for philosophers of education to build up rational or theoretical constructs of normative patterns, value systems, or acceptable systems of philosophy which can be used to make sense of national systems of education. The arbitrary character of the choices which will have to be made in order to proceed should be recognized. The techniques of analysis are, however, well developed and the possibilities are excellent of establishing constructs useful in comparative education studies.

Given a system of philosophy from which to work, with what kinds of questions should philosophers of education concern themselves? At present two tendencies can be discerned. Some philosophers start from philosophical questions and analyze in great detail the meaning of terms associated with them. Such starting points lead almost inevitably to esoteric discussions designed to improve techniques of analysis. Logical consistency is examined. Distinctions between meanings are drawn. Attention is paid to the characteristics and types of definition. The "meaning of meaning" and the nature of knowledge are proper subjects of inquiry. Such philosophers are the pure physicists of education not the engineers; their work is perhaps less system oriented than the next group of philosophers of education; they are perhaps less committed to education and to the achievement of stated goals and objectives.

Philosophers of education are social engineers insofar as they clarify the aims and goals of educational systems and make explicit the implications of accepted premises. As such many of

them believe that the starting points of philosophical analysis should be educational issues, problems and assumptions. Among such exponents two categories of questions have received considerable attention recently. There are first of all classroom or school terms such as learning, teaching, subject disciplines, authority, discipline and its sanctions, the curriculum and so on. The second category of terms relate to the educational system as a whole. In this group, terms such as equality, social disadvantage, selection, organization and structure fall.

Among English philosophers of education there are those who hold that, because the tests of education are intrinsic to it, there is little purpose in going beyond them since education has its own goals and the achievement of them can be judged in educational terms. This form of assessment is based on means-ends relationships. Additional forms of inquiry would evaluate the internal consistency of educational ends. An assessment of the consistency of institutional practices to achieve these ends, though desirable, is hardly a task for the philosopher.

The belief that education can be judged solely in educational terms would, of course, be rejected by most pragmatists and by comparative educationists who follow the lead given to them by Sir Michael Sadler who held as very important tests of an educational system which were intrinsic to it. His view that educational processes could only be understood in the light of the relationships between education and other aspects of society has had a profound effect on comparative educationists. The tests of a good education are in terms of ends-means relationships but the goals are not only internal to education but external to it. Education promotes democracy, political stability, higher standards of living and greater social harmony. Political, economic and social class tests can therefore legitimately be applied to education. To be sure, it is important to make plain the criteria on which these tests are based. Against what criteria can social harmony be measured? What are the constituents of political stability? How can economic standards of living be measured? One task of the philosopher of education would be to examine these indices, make them much more explicit than at present so that the testers may devise empirical instruments which are reliable and valid. Again the comparative dimension of the problem of establishing by philosophical methods instruments to evaluate educational achievement on an international basis should be considered most carefully. Unfortunately these tasks are not always regarded by

philosophers as legitimate and psychometrists all too frequently assume that they are unnecessary.

There is a range of problems which appears to be neglected at present by philosophers of education. These are the major socio-economic and political issues of the day. Most of them arise from processes of rapid and asynchronous social change. The assumptions and theories relating to social change need critical examination. Traditional theories abound. Most of them emphasize the lag between technological development and the value system of a pre-industrial society. It is a viewpoint which does not run contrary to the main thesis of this paper. One contention of this paper is, however, that too little attention has been paid to the lag between political changes and value systems which were appropriate in the age of imperialism. Concepts of leadership, democracy, elitism, governing and non-governing elites and mass education need to be subjected to further logical analysis. In very general terms this has been done. A comparative international dimension has perhaps been lacking. Moreover, perhaps not enough attention has been given to an analysis of logical coherence and consistency (or lack thereof) in national value systems of the post World War Two period. There is need particularly to identify normative inconsistencies and to clarify through philosophy public and professional debates. I think particularly of the debates which took place in England at the close of the war. The issue was planning. Should England's post-war society be subject to total planning, to partial planning or to none at all? The philosophical debate between Mannheim on the one hand—arguing in favor of a democratically planned society—and Hayek and Popper on the other, arguing in favor either of *laissez faire* or a modified process of piecemeal social engineering, had real political significance. It was central to the opposing policies of the Labour and Tory parties. The issue was domestic. The provision of a rationale in terms of which it could be debated at various levels was extremely important. The debate has had considerable implications for philosophy too.

Today many of the most pressing problems for which national solutions are needed have an important international component. Consider for example the issues arising out of technical assistance programs. One of them arises from intercultural conflicts in which in any country three or four competitors are to be found. The indigenous culture faces that brought to it by the technical expert

whose cultural assumptions may be in conflict with those of a former colonial power and in competition with those of another contemporary great power. For example, the technical assistant from America may meet in an indigenous culture some elements of a European culture and competition from Soviet advisers. In this situation the teacher or adviser should examine the bases of his own assumptions; compare them with the assumptions which inhere in the indigenous culture, the assumptions of the European system which until recently prevailed and the value system of Soviet experts.

The object of philosophical analysis should be to point out the areas of major disagreement and the possibilities of normative adjustment. Only after careful and critical analysis of terms drawn from politics, education, economics, religion and sociology in comparative perspective should the effectiveness of proposed policies be examined. Anthropologists doubtless are needed to examine the value system of many indigenous cultures but philosophers should, it seems to me, take seriously the task of studying in terms of present political and educational needs the philosophical assumptions of the major world religions, e.g., Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam and the secular traditions, for example, of Confucianism and Shintoism and their derivatives.

Such philosophical investigations, necessary though they are, are not themselves a sufficient basis on which to build educational policy. Investigations based on means-ends and means-outcomes relationships will almost certainly be interdisciplinary and contain important empirical components. It is important to point out that empirical techniques reflect a set of philosophical assumptions just as much as do the techniques of critical philosophical analysis. Failure to grasp this fact helps to explain the defects of several large-scale comparative education studies recently completed. The International Educational Achievement project lacked such a philosophical base, consequently the empirical techniques employed in it, though in themselves carefully examined and modified for comparative use, were often inappropriate.

In conclusion I should like to mention a problem of international significance which in my judgement should concern American philosophers of education as well as empirical investigators. A crucial issue for the U.S.A. in light of its bilateral commitments to involve itself in the defence of territories abroad concerns political stability. To examine the theoretical constituents of political stability would involve the acceptance of a political

science theory on the basis of which a number of hypotheses could be given precise meaning. Tests could then be devised which would enable them to be studied empirically.

Of the many theories of government available I suggest by way of example those put forward by V. Pareto in his monumental *Mind and Society*. There he maintained that important to the maintenance of political stability is the balance of *Lions* and *Foxes* in the composition of political and social elites and the provision of opportunities for the circulation of elites. He examined the psychological bases of human and group action and categorized political leaders as either Lions prepared to use force to gain and hold on to power or as Foxes who seek cleverly to persuade and manipulate without resort to force. According to Pareto, there should be a balance in a governing elite. An accumulation of Lions in the non-governing elite or among the masses may lead to revolution against a government unable, because it lacks Lions, to reach firm decisions and stand by them. Too many Lions in a government would make it possible for Foxes among the masses to overthrow by force a manifestly unsuitable government.

Crudely stated in this way such a theory may suggest little scope for careful philosophical analysis. But meaning has, however, to be given to many key terms: "residues," "derivations," "governing elite," "sentiments," "non-governing elite," "stability," "revolution" and so on. Criteria need to be established which will make it possible to use these terms unambiguously in comparative studies. The qualities of mind and disposition associated with Lions and Foxes should be analyzed. This example suggests that to be effective philosophers of education need to analyze their social and political terms within a stated cultural context or against a known political theory. Unless this is done their discussion of words such as "democracy," "authority," and "permissiveness" will be of little value in comparative and international studies.

Follow-up studies should be empirical. For example, how do national systems of education operate as agencies of selection? How do they pick out future members of the governing elite? Which qualities are important in selection procedures? Those of the Lion or those of the Fox? And after selection what qualities of leadership are inculcated through the educational system? Are the qualities of Lions emphasized or those of the Foxes? What kind of balance is drawn in the educational system? Has France

habitually picked out through her educational examination system potential Foxes and encouraged in them the qualities of mind associated with them? To what extent have the English Public schools in the past paid attention both to Lions and Foxes and selected out for political leadership positions both the intellectuals and the rugby players? Or again how far have Americans disregarded in the past the role of the schools as agents of selection of a political elite? What qualities of character and intellect have other agencies of selection emphasized? What in these terms are the implications of the gifted child movement? And the effort made by President Kennedy to draw more intellectuals into government? What implications are there in these terms for education in light of present American debates about Vietnam?

Some evidence from history may throw light on these questions. In the newly independent countries where missionaries shouldered the burden of education until recently it is all too evident that future political leaders were the products of the mission schools. What kind of person was selected by these systems of education? What attitudes and character traits were encouraged among young people who were later to lead their countries to independence? And against this form of selection what was the role of other agencies such as the armed services and the trade unions? Were the seeds of post-independence unrest and revolution sown by systems of education?

What are the consequences of drawing sharp boundaries between the governing and non-governing elites? To what extent does an educational system inhibit the circulation of elites? Are American intellectuals politicians? Are politicians capable of offering cultural leadership? The divorce in the nineteenth and early twentieth century between the German academics and the politicians was doubtless a serious factor in the collapse of effective parliamentary government before the Second World War.

These hints at possible lines of approach in the study of relationships between education and political stability are intended only to reveal the extent to which comparative studies focused on major and pressing socio-economic and political studies need to be sustained by interdisciplinary studies and among these some of the most important are those that can be pursued by philosophers of education either collectively or as individuals. I hope they will accept such challenges. I feel that Dewey would have recognized the need to internationalize his work and would have responded to the challenge.

CHAPTER III

Discernments Concerning United States Educational Aid to African Nations

FRANKLIN PARKER

Benedum Professor of Education
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

This paper concerns United States aid to African education, with some comparisons made to unilateral aid by other countries, multilateral aid by a group of countries and aid given through international organizations such as Unesco. This topic may be approached by asking a series of questions: How, when, and why did the United States become an exporter of educational aid to Africa? What are the peculiar needs of African education which American educators should understand? What consequences flow from the kinds of educational aid we give to African countries? What misunderstandings have arisen as a result of United States aid to Africa? What are the present trends and likely future directions of our educational aid to Africa?

We may be reminded that before our country became an exporter of educational aid, it was itself a borrower of educational ideas. We borrowed the dame school, academy, and college from England; the elementary school pattern from Prussia; the high school from Scotland; and the kindergarten and graduate school from Germany. Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, Calvin Stowe, and many other American educators and scholars went to Europe to observe, write about, and borrow educational ideas, and to adapt these to American conditions. Perhaps the junior high school, the junior college and the land grant college were a few indigenous American educational institutions; and yet, even for these, a case can be made for some prior European models. We dropped some educational borrowings, transformed others and may have invented a few school units and ideas. In little more than a century of commitment to universal education, we used

our schools to adapt to changing times. We were favored by conditions of geography, frontier expansion, immigrants willing to work hard, borrowed capital (such internal improvements as canals and railroads were originally financed by the sale of state bonds abroad in the 1830's and after) and other factors which enabled us to couple our school units into a ladder of opportunity for all. We have not yet achieved for all youths the highest rungs of that school ladder, but accomplishments here have more nearly approached the ideal than elsewhere in the world. Robert Browning's insight is appropriate—that one's reach should o'er reach his grasp.

The Phelps-Stokes Commission Reports, 1922 and 1924

Early American educational aid abroad was associated with the missionary zeal that penetrated Asia, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere beginning in the early 19th century. The same religious motivation which had advanced education in this country from the time of the Pilgrims through the Great Awakening and after was repeated in missions around the world where schools were built alongside of churches. This missionary effort was both a European and an American movement. In Africa, however, it fell upon an American private foundation to make the first major assessment of educational needs on something of a continual basis. I refer to the reports of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions of 1922 and 1924.

The work of these commissions can be explained briefly through the example of Rhodesia in south-central Africa, a country about which I know a little. Missionary societies of various denominations had established churches and schools some 20 years before the British took control in 1890. The British South Africa Company, which administered the territory, passed the first education ordinance in 1899 with small grants for African students in mission schools. The missions regularly discussed educational policy at their conferences as did the Government in the Legislative Council, the white settlers through the press and the Africans through their community meetings. No one was entirely satisfied with African education. The missions resented government control and inadequate support. The Government criticized the missions for their interdenominational rivalries in which the African was the pawn. White settlers criticized the missions for giving Africans an overly academic education which made them dissatisfied with menial work. The more advanced

Africans criticized the missions, Government and white settlers for withholding from them an academic education of first quality.

Britain planned an Imperial Conference in 1921 to examine African education in the British territories, but the onset of World War I absorbed their attention and the war drained their resources. American missions, however, less hampered by the war and inspired by President Woodrow Wilson's post-war idealism and their own growing needs in African education, looked for sounder policy formulations. This direction came from a private American foundation, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, whose first commission surveyed African education from 1919 to 1922 in Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast (now Ghana), Nigeria, South Africa, Angola, the Congo and Liberia. The commission, with an international flavor, was led by Thomas Jesse Jones, a Welsh-born and American-educated sociologist (Columbia University, who had directed research at Hampton Institute, the Negro school in Virginia); and also included J. E. K. Aggrey, respected Gold Coast educator and an African; a Scottish missionary couple; and an American medical missionary. Their report and the report of the second commission in 1924,* emphasized that education should be based on the practical skills and knowledge needed by Africans in their everyday lives. Besides this priority, the reports recognized that academic education for some elites was necessary. More government support of missionary effort was urged, along with cooperation among missions, the Government and the African people.

This policy direction was re-emphasized in the 1926 conference on African cultural devolpment held at Le Zoute, Belgium, and was most clearly enunciated in a policy statement made in 1925 by the newly formed Colonial Office advisory board on African education:

> Education should be adapted to the mentality, aptitudes, occupations and traditions of the various peoples, conserving as far as possible all sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social life. . . . Its aim should be to render the individual more efficient in his or her condition of life. . . . It must include the raising up of capable, trustworthy, public-spirited leaders of the people. . . . As resources permit, the door of advancement, through higher education, in Africa must be increasingly opened for those who by character, ability and temperament show themselves fitted to profit by such education.

* Included Drs. Jones and Aggrey from the first commission and surveyed Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Nyasaland, Zanzibar, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, Ruanda-Urundi, Portuguese East Africa, and Abyssinia.

Between the Wars: Change and Urbanization

The policy recommended by the Phelps-Stokes Commissions of educating the African to become efficient and wholesome in his own environment, of adapting the school to rural community life, was not successful. Sound knowledge of indigenous African history, customs, and culture which would have given Africans pride in themselves and their past was not then available and is, even now, some 40 years later, just being unearthed in research being done in universities in Africa and elsewhere. Not only was authentic cultural material not available but African schools continued to be removed from the realities of African life. Tending small school garden plots was inadequate preparation for young Africans who would have to cultivate totally different kinds of crops in a viable agricultural economy. Similarly, health and hygiene were taught by rote and were superimposed on an academic bookish curriculum tied to annual examinations and culminating in examinations marking various levels of school leaving certificates. The few of the intellectual elite with financial resources who could succeed academically sought the prize by climbing the rote-memory school ladder while the majority of their fellows dropped out along the way, many still illiterate or only barely literate.

Better health conditions, a higher birth rate, ever larger school enrollments, inadequate financial support, crowded schoolrooms, and above all urbanization exacerbated the situation and kept the 3-R approach dominant. In the Rhodesias, for example, the drift to towns was accelerated by expanding mining operations just prior to and during World War II. As the towns grew, the Government Departments of Education found they had to start, staff and finance secondary schools while leaving the vast and often inefficient elementary school system to missionary effort. But the towns were also the seedbeds of squalor and crime, and source of anti-colonial agitation and eventually of growing nationalist movements which in the post-war period ousted the colonial powers and led to a rapid pattern of independence.

Colonial Education Patterns

Since post-independence educational patterns tended at first to perpetuate colonial educational policies, it may be useful to summarize these policies. The British subsidized mission schools whose aim was to provide religious literacy for the masses and also to educate just enough white-collar Africans on the secondary

and higher levels as were needed and could be employed to aid government administration and commercial enterprise. British policy, however, was more liberal than that of other European colonial powers and Britain did begin to prepare its territories for eventual self-rule, although not as fast as African nationalists desired. In British territories the Africans' growing desire for academic education after World War II helped produce a new kind of militantly nationalistic African. He came from such schools as Ghana's Achimoto, the Sudan's Gordon College, Nigeria's Kaduna and Uganda's Makerere College—all of which had begun as secondary schools. These elite Africans have since wrested control of their countries from Britain and have been trying to bring into modernity the traditional structure of their African culture through education.

Of the other European colonial policies, the French were less liberal in providing educational opportunities for the masses but more culture-centered in educating the African intellectuals. The Belgians were even more paternalistic in educating Africans as helpers in such industrial efforts as copper mining. At Congolese independence, there were reportedly fewer than twenty university graduates. Colonial control was quickly swept away beginning with Ghana in 1957 and increasingly after 1960 until some 40 countries in Africa are now independent. The need for a continental assessment of African education became obvious.

Unesco: The Addis Ababa Conference, 1961

This continental plan was made by Unesco and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) at a conference which convened in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 1961. Representatives from 34 African countries were present together with observers from 24 other nations and from U.N. agencies and international organizations. At the time, 1961, it was estimated that 80 per cent to 85 per cent of the adults in Africa were illiterate, nearly twice the world average; that fewer than half of middle Africa's 25 million children of school age would complete primary education; that fewer than three of every one hundred would get into a secondary school; and that fewer than two of every thousand would receive some sort of higher education.

The chief goals set for continental Africa by 1980 were as follows: 6 years of free primary education for all children; 20 per cent of primary school leavers to enter secondary schools; and about 2 per cent of these to enter higher education. Expenditures

on African education in terms of this 20-year perspective were expected to rise from $450 million in 1960 to over $2 billion in 1980. This setting of continental African educational goals by Unesco gave each country targets to aim at and helped to align their economic priorities so as to invest as much as they could in education. Much but not enough has been accomplished since 1961. To complicate the picture, rising school-age population is playing havoc with the Addis Ababa goals. Thus, it will be necessary to reassess these goals every few years and this is being done. Despite shortcomings, the Addis Ababa conference emphasized the need for each country to attempt national planning in terms of population, the economy, manpower needs and other factors. The economic aspects of education have come under more and more careful scrutiny.

The International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris

By far the largest, most important and most productive international planning agency for education is the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP). It was established in mid-1963 by Unesco in cooperation with the World Bank, the French Government and the Ford Foundation. As of June, 1967, its scholars had produced fourteen IIEP African Research Monographs (two others were in preparation) and had studied intensively the educational problems in the five African countries of the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania and Uganda.

The case for sound educational planning by a team of scholars including educators, economists, agriculturalists, industrial planners and others is now an accepted pattern, not only in Africa, but in all developing countries. Indeed, education as an investment industry directly tied to manpower needs and economic growth is becoming an accepted concept in every country. Witness the entry of big business in American public education and in such government antipoverty programs as the Office of Economic Opportunity's Job Corps, in which Philco-Ford, Lytton Industries, and other firms are now largely and perhaps permanently engaged. Witness also the growing spread of comprehensive secondary education in European countries and the opening up of more and more places in higher education. We are on the threshold of a vast world-wide uplift of educational attainment, slow now but mounting and destined I think to climb astronomically as we enter the 21st century. Indeed, that century may be dominated by two accomplishments; the exploration of

space by advanced nations and the leveling up of less developed nations to modern standards educationally, economically and in social and political arrangements. Foreign aid is the necessary bridge between the rich nations and the poor nations, and educational aspects of that aid are a fundamental necessity if our world is to hang together.

National Patterns of Educational Aid to Africa

As England, France, and other European colonial powers relinquished political control over their African territories, educational aid has been stressed in the national development schemes of these newly independent countries. The natural interest of preserving British, French, Belgian and other European cultural interests and economic ties is understandable. These European countries made capital investments in Africa and by scholarships encouraged African students to attend their universities. The U.S.S.R. made smaller capital investments but launched a large scholarship effort to attract Africans to the Lumumba Friendship University and to other Soviet institutions of learning. I remember a young Kenyan African at a Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) mission school who spoke to me about getting a scholarship to attend an American college. I turned the request over to the American consul's office and on my return some months later to that same mission school was dismayed to hear that the Kenyan had accepted a scholarship to Lumumba Friendship University. The Communist Chinese promised some capital investments in Africa but have been relatively inactive in providing educational assistance.

United States Pattern of Educational Aid to Africa

The United States effort in foreign aid 20 years ago focused initially on European recovery and the success of the $12 billion Marshall Plan is obvious in growing European economic vitality and unity. Not until the late 1950's did the United States begin to give significant assistance to African education. This aid comes from many private American sources, such as the Ford, Carnegie, and other foundations, as well as other private agencies and religious bodies, but also largely from the United States Government through the Agency for International Development (AID). The scope of this AID expenditure can be seen in the figures for 1966 when it committed $21.3 million to African education. This amount of aid was 15 per cent of AID's total ex-

penditure in Africa and almost 30 per cent of its worldwide educational programs. AID has largely concentrated on African countries with the most favorable development potentials and increasingly on encouragement of indigenous educational capabilities. Much AID support of education in Africa is channeled through contracts with the United States universities which are responsible for the actual operation of the projects. United States Government aid to African education is also extended through the Peace Corps and the Department of State's educational and cultural exchange program.

AID's 1966 commitment of $21.3 million for African education is only part of the larger American educational aid to Africa. In 1962 the African Liaison Committee of the American Council on Education made an inventory of major private and public American agencies rendering educational aid to Africa. The figures showed private aid to be $16,165,410 and total government aid to be $86,927,279, for a grand total of $103,092,689, but even this inventory was probably below the actual amount given that year to African education.

Example of One United States Program of Educational Aid to East Africa

An example of one university's contribution to East African education, that of the Center for Education in Africa at Teachers College, Columbia University, may be given. From 1961, when AID contracts began, to 1964, Teachers College recruited and trained 443 teachers for secondary schools in the East African countries of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. Following this secondary school teacher supply program, the Teachers College Center began another program of supplying staff members to teacher training colleges in these East African countries—in effect strengthening the number and quality of the indigenous teacher supply in those African countries. Peace Corps volunteers have also been trained for Africa at this center. Recently, research programs on improving instruction in African education have been launched and there has been a continual flow of young Americans with African experience and expertise enriching the entire program at Teachers College, the African countries they serve and the American institutions they go to following their African experience. When one reflects on the research theses and dissertations completed, the Americans trained as African education specialists and the feedback that results, it becomes

gratifyingly clear that educational aid abroad enriches the donor as well as the recipient far beyond the original financial investment made in these programs.

New United States Policy of Regional Aid to Africa

In late December, 1967, and early January, 1968, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey made a good will tour to nine African countries. This visit marked a new policy turn in United States aid to Africa. The change stressed by this visit is one from aid to individual countries to aid to regional groupings of African countries. Vice President Humphrey stressed this regional approach in his speeches in Africa:

> You are reaching outward toward new regional cooperation. We enthusiastically support these efforts. One of the lessons of recent history has been that both markets and economic units must be large enough to permit economic diversification, competitiveness, and full employment.

The aid Vice President Humphrey had in mind was mainly economic aid, yet we can infer that educational aid is also intended to go to regional groups of African states. How this new policy will affect African education is yet to be seen. One early model to note is the preferred educational aid which has gone to the University of East Africa, headquartered at Kampala, Uganda, and serving mainly Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya. The University of East Africa is thus a trinational university. But recently both Kenya and Tanzania have decided to withdraw from this arrangement and to establish their own universities. We have yet to see if the new policy of regional aid will hold neighboring African states together economically and educationally. At least two implications of Vice President Humphrey's trip would seem to be indicated: First, the trip recognized Africa's emerging importance, since no American official of such high rank has visited Africa since Vice President Nixon's visit ten years ago. Second, aid tied to regional cooperation is intended to make more efficient use of American dollars and scholars sent to Africa. Third, the regional approach is designed to strengthen regional cooperation in Africa so as to emulate the success of the European common market idea.

Why Give Educational Aid to Africa?

I have already mentioned the return educational aid to Africa feeds back to our own country in terms of Americans who be-

come specialists in African affairs and education, how it enriches our own curriculum offerings in public schools and teachers colleges, and how it helps to promote international understanding. There are also moral reasons for giving educational aid, such as helping one's neighbor; of easing the gap between the have and have-not nations; and helping people help themselves in many ways, including population control and technological advancement. But the blunt reason why we give aid abroad is national self-interest. Let us see how and why Africa has become important to our national interest.

Along with Asia and Latin America, Africa forms part of the small but growing and still largely uncommitted third world between the democratic West and the Communist East. Both want to win the allegiance of this third world whose people when educated and resources when developed will more than tip the future balance of ascendancy for East or West. Africa's place in this underdeveloped third world is growing.

Africa came late upon the world scene but it came with a burst of independent countries, just over 40 now, each a member of the United Nations, each with a voice and a vote. Another striking explanation for growing interest in Africa can be understood when you recall that Africa below the Sahara, with a population of some 200 million, half that of India, has over 40 votes in the United Nations. This fact has not been lost on the great powers. The East-West competition for African support in the United Nations has been strong and intense on a number of issues.

Another evidence of Africa's growing international importance is the fact that some African countries have been involved in the Sino-Soviet split. The case of Somalia illustrates the competition between the two Communist giants. Somalia has long had violent border disputes with both Ethiopia and Kenya. Somalia first turned to Communist China for assistance and arms. But because of Somalia's strategic position, the Soviet Union decided to outbid the Chinese. Today, Somalia's armed forces are largely Russian-equipped and trained and much of its economic and educational assistance comes from the Soviet bloc. In turn, Ethiopia receives much United States aid and Kenya a great deal of British aid.

East and West also clashed in the Congo, with the Communists supporting the late Patrice Lumumba in 1960 and the United States supporting the Leopoldville Government in 1964. Guinea

in the former French West Africa is another country which, after independence from France in September, 1958, first turned to the Communist countries for various kinds of aid, and then, when the Soviet ambassador interfered with their internal affairs, looked to the United States for aid. This rapprochement with the West lasted until 1965 when Guinea again swung back toward Soviet and Chinese aid. These are but a few examples of Africa's growing role in international politics.

It is to the United States' interest that African states remain independent and strong, that they themselves resist Soviet and/or Communist Chinese subversion, takeovers, and so-called "wars of national liberation." To assure this stability, the United States is interested in sustaining the economies and the educational development of African countries. However, the fact is that United States aid to Africa is small in comparison to aid given to other developing areas. The priority given to Africa tends to be low, with annual aid in recent years averaging about $200 million. Matching this past low priority in amount of aid has been our inconsistent formula in giving the aid.

Suggested Strategy for More Effective Educational Aid to Africa

We have been engaged now for some 20 years in a far-flung effort to help developing nations. Some such effort must undoubtedly be continued by the United States, by the newly strengthened European countries and by such newly industrialized nations as Japan and Israel. The population explosion alone requires that developing countries run faster educationally just to maintain their present state of advancement. Economic and educational aid would seem to be necessities for the rest of this century at least. How to make this effort an efficient one is the central problem. How to formulate a desirable policy of aid to African education is the crucial question. What strategy to adopt becomes a present necessity. The following thoughts seem to me to be worthy of further consideration.

Since our educational aid has been too diverse, too scattered and perhaps too inefficient, why could not a strategy center be established in one of the larger universities which provides the bulk of educational aid to Africa? At such a center could be gathered the information we now possess about African educational problems. Research could be focused there. Priorities could be established. Experiences could be pooled. Strategies could be developed. Reform could be attempted. Innovations could be

tried out. Centralization alone won't accomplish these things. But cooperative and cumulative effort at one center by private organizations already involved and with key personnel from government agency programs already in operation could be coordinated. This then is a plea for a Strategic Planning Center for Educational Aid to Africa. I would hope that there could be a similar center for educational aid to Asia and one for Latin America and that the research and findings of these centers would be exchanged and coordinated.

Another essential need would seem to be a professional program of preparation of educational planners, be these educators, economists, political scientists, agricultural specialists, health and medical practitioners and others from every major field and discipline. Such personnel in fact do get into programs of educational planning and educational aid. They drift into it one way or another because their institutions become involved in educational aid abroad or because their expertise is tapped for a particular project abroad. What I am suggesting is a more organized program of selection and training of educational planners and their more effective use in educational aid programs. Such a program of professional training might be organized in connection with the previously mentioned Strategic Planning Center for Educational Aid to Africa.

One final need which comes to mind is an overall strategy for financing and distributing educational aid to Africa. As valuable as is binational aid, and as useful as are multinational efforts, it seems to me that the role of an international agency such as Unesco is essential in making efficient the now disparate efforts of so many agencies and governments involved in educational aid to Africa. The United Nations has named the 1960's as the decade of development. We have made only a start in this direction. The 1970's and beyond must continue this effort if the world is to see real progress in making the developing countries fully developed and viable. We stand on the brink of a new age and a new century when the hope and promise of a good life for all is within our grasp. We cannot, we must not, lose this opportunity.

CHAPTER IV

Towards a Study of Comparative Sex Education: Conceptions and Misconceptions

ROBERT M. BJORK

Professor of Economics and Sociology
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee

The world of 1968 is strikingly different from the world of 1948 in many ways, but perhaps no area of people's lives and attitudes has been so altered in this period as those relating to sex. There has been an extraordinary popularization of the term "population explosion," and an increasing frankness in the way people now react toward such questions as size of family, contraception, abortion and other aspects of the population problem. In both high and popular culture there has been a rapid acceleration in public acceptance of the candid use of sexual terms and descriptions. Social problems relating to sex such as illegitimacy, venereal disease, divorce, sexual deviance and sexual crime, are all much discussed; it is also clear that many of these problems once thought to be almost automatically on the way to complete solution have stubbornly persisted or become worse.

Thus, the current social climate in many countries is one in which human fertility is causing concern, and methods of limiting it are a major topic for discussion. Sexual description and symbolism in literature, popular media, and music has become more frank and more prevalent, and old sex-related problems, once thought to be on the way to solution, remain persistent. Given this ethos, people in a number of countries have become much more friendly to the idea of including rational programs of sex instruction in the school curriculum.

This paper presents an overview of sex instruction in the schools of Sweden, certain Communist nations, and the United States. There are considerable differences among these countries in the degree to which sex instruction has been instituted throughout the school system, on the relative emphasis given to various types of sexual learnings, and the degree of openness allowed in discussion and description. Much of the material in this paper, however, will concern Sweden, which has the most developed pattern of formal sex instruction in the schools.

In Sweden, sex education began to be introduced in the 1930's in a few enterprising urban schools. Government Population Commissions in 1935 and again in 1941 recommended sex instruction in the schools. These recommendations were not based at all on a concern for lowering the birth rate, since Sweden had then and has now one of the lowest rates of natural increase in the world. Rather, it was felt that family stability and population quality demanded a rational attitude toward sex.

Swedish educational circles became convinced in the mid-1950's that voluntary programs of sex education were so widespread and generally approved that a mandatory program to spread sex instruction to all Swedish school children was the next logical step. Since only one per cent of the students in Sweden attend private schools, and since even these schools are under the authority of the National Board of Education, the compulsory sex education program instituted by the National Board of Education in 1956 immediately affected each and every child in Sweden.

The National Board had published teachers' manuals on sex education during the 1940's. When sex education became compulsory in 1956, a new authoritative edition entitled *Sex Instruction in Swedish Schools* was issued for the use of teachers. This handbook presented a general rationale for the inclusion of sex instruction in the schools, a list of topics thought to be appropriate to four different age groups (7 to 10 years old; 11 to 13; 14 to 16; and 17 to 20), subject matter commentaries and lesson-examples. Within three or four years, opposition to various parts of this official handbook became significant. Mainly this opposition came from the so-called "cultural radicals" who were insistent on complete equality between the sexes, a single standard, tolerance of sexual deviance, a tentative and instrumental view of pre-marital and extra-marital relations and increased attention to and support of contraceptives and voluntary abor-

tion. Since the handbook explicitly condemns pre-marital sexual relations, has little to say about contraception or sexual deviance, and does not grapple with the question of the "double morality standard," it was subject to increasing criticism. Lars Gustafson, a relatively moderate critic of the sex education program, had this to say in 1964:

> Instead of trying to adjust young people to a sound sex and family life, the schools are spreading terrifying pictures of the perils of relations before marriage. Instead of teaching about contraceptives and helping to make them an obvious measure of protection in such relations, the schools are warning pupils about their unreliability and contributing in that way to the social affliction of both children and parents involved in extramarital pregnancies at an altogether too early age. There is, it has been said, no rational argument against the fact that young people adjust to a normal sex life through premarital relations except the one about the perils of having a child. In this situation, it is more suitable to get rid of this argument by spreading the use of contraceptives and better sex education than to try to retain a prohibition which is proving to be ideologically empty.[1]

Not only articulate writers such as Gustafson protested. Complaining parents wrote letters to various newspapers; one father of a fourteen year old daughter wrote the following to a Stockholm paper in 1961:

> To teach our own prejudices, our own doubts, our own bewilderments, leads nowhere. We need an entirely new point of view, one which accepts teen-age sexual activity simply because it exists, and there is nothing we can do about it. Therefore, we also need a thorough instruction in contraceptive techniques. Those who have no idea of how emotionally involved normal teen-agers are in their sexual relationships often claim that safe contraceptives would lead to increased promiscuity. This is probably untrue. But even if it should lead to twice as much intercourse, but only half as many unwelcome children it would still be a step in the right direction.[2]

By 1964 dissatisfaction had mounted to the point that a government commission was appointed to revise the handbook and generally to improve sex education. The commission has yet to complete its revision, although, in 1965, a change was effected in the handbook material to be taught seventeen to twenty year olds. It deleted some passages insisting on continence during adolescence and substituted a rather vague passage proposing that sexual norms are necessary, but they may vary from place to place and from time to time.[3]

There is little question that the issue surrounded by the greatest acrimony in the revision of the handbook concerns the question of premarital sex and premarital use of contraceptives. Passages in the original handbook, such as the following from a lesson-example for ages 14 to 16 are those drawing the greatest criticism from people desiring liberalization:

> At your age, and in general while you are still growing up, you should not engage in sexual relations. . . Don't imagine that you can rely on contraceptives to prevent pregnancy and children being born. Boys are very ready to assure girls that nothing of that sort can happen. But it happens sometimes all the same. . . By abstaining from sexual relations during the years when you are still growing up, you are giving yourself the best prospects for one day building your own home with the one you love, and living happily together.[4]

This passage and others like it are the major targets for those who wish to break the hold of what they consider to be an outdated morality. For a time, it appeared that their strategy was to make the sex education programs in the schools wholly physiological, with all material relating to morality deleted. This change was and is still strongly opposed by various sections of Swedish opinion. Many "free church" elements and also activists in the "established" Lutheran church are not at all willing to see the moral aspects dropped. At present in the upper grades, the medical and biological aspects of sex are covered in biology, the moral and ethical ones in religion classes (all Swedish schools have such classes), and the social aspects in history classes.

A 1963 article in *Dagen*, a "free" church Pentecostal paper, illustrates the reaction of certain conservative and church oriented individuals to the drive to completely biologicalize the sex education program. In this article, strong opposition is expressed toward any modification of the ethical and moral aspects of sex education. Authorities should not change, it states, because "if we always let the majority lead us then morality will be thrown out."[5] Even a reform which would allow various moral positions to be presented to the students and then ask them to make up their own minds is opposed. The article contends that if the school doesn't hold to its duty to discourage pre-marital sexual experimentation, it would be the same as giving in to teen-age drunkenness just because such teen-age drinking is increasing.[6] Actually, some conservative minded persons oppose any truly candid physiological treatment of sex for the young because they think such frankness degrades sex. A 1962 editorial in *Dagen* argued that the

moral condition of Sweden had deteriorated, and that this was related to "premature sex education, which serves to make our population into sexual idiots." [7] The editor contended that people become sexual idiots if they fail to elevate sex to the level of poetry, and thus give it a meaning far removed from its gross physiological aspects.

Even some leaders in the sex education movement, who are not in sympathy with some of the moral positions in the official handbook, are nevertheless wary of going to a sex education program which is wholly biological in nature. Mrs. Maj-Brigt Bergström-Walan, one of the major figures in Swedish sex education, wrote an article in 1962 in which she warned that "in the rush to get out of the ditch of convention and outdated moralisms, there is a risk that we may fall in another ditch where all inhibitions are lost and mere cold technique is foremost." [8] She was concerned that the biological facts were not being taught as well as they should, but even worse was the situation with regard to the psychological and ethical point of view. Mrs. Bergström-Walan considers it essential to keep a moral and ethical dimension in sex education, but she feels that specially gifted and sensitive people should be sought out to discuss these matters with the children. Rigid preachments against pre-marital sex are not particularly useful. Within the last few years, it appears that those who would keep moral, ethical and psychological aspects of sex in the curriculum are likely to prevail. However, the moral problems will likely be dealt with on a much more tentative basis than was intended in the original handbook. There has been much discussion about a new book used presently in many schools to present sex education to 14 to 16 year olds. One professor of education, a very religious free Lutheran, in an interview with the author, indicated he was sadly aware of the spreading use of this book, and was quite appalled by the trend. He insisted that the book clearly contradicts the official handbook's position on pre-marital sex, and he seemed to have some hope that something could be done to discourage the use of the book. The book, *Vagen till Mognad* (*Way to Maturity*), makes an effort to be neutral, yet thorough, in its treatment of sexual morality. It states, without comment, those things which are prohibited in formal law, and then lists norms not legally codified, but upon which nearly everyone could agree. Then it presents the matter of pre-marital sex as an issue on which there is no clear agreement:

Certain paragraphs in Swedish law deal with people's sexual life. Rape, for example, is punished by law. It is also prohibited by law to have intercourse with someone under 15 years old. Also it is punishable by law to have intercourse with close relatives, sisters and brothers for instance. Neither can anyone have homosexual relations with anyone under 18 years of age.

Furthermore, there are quite a few norms and rules about sex life, which are not printed in the law. Most often these rules are aspects of rules which apply to all human relations. Most people agree on the rule that one's actions should not harm a fellow being. Therefore, it is also immoral to have intercourse without contraceptives if one is not prepared to take care of the child which can be the result. Most people also agree that one should not lie to others. Therefore, it is also immoral to try to have intercourse with someone by untruthfully telling that person that one is in love with him or her.

However, what makes the question about sexual morality so difficult, is that in many cases people cannot agree about what one ought and ought not do. Especially many people consider the question—When may two people have sexual intercourse?—as the main point at issue in sexual morality. The following viewpoints are rather common:

1. Sexual life belongs only within marriage.
2. Sexual intercourse is allowed with the one with whom one is planning to marry. Many feel, for example, that if a couple is betrothed by rings (both the woman and man) and put an engagement notice in the newspaper, then intimate relations are allowed.
3. If a couple is going steady and is in love, then intimate relations are allowed, even if the couple is not engaged.
4. Sex relations between people who are only acquaintances have most generally been considered wrong. However, in our time, there are some people who think that such relations should be accepted.[9]

The book discusses at some length each of these four positions, and then asks the student to make up his own mind after serious and thoughtful consideration of the various arguments. The authors point out:

> . . . what we consider to be the most important thing is that each and every young person think through these problems. We know that many will come to agree with the traditional church point of view that sex life belongs in marriage only. Others may decide that it is defensible to start sexual life before marriage. We believe that a person is worthy of respect when he himself has worked to arrive at an opinion and resolves to live in accordance with it. The main thing is that he or she is prepared to take the consequences of one's actions, and that full consideration is given the partner. A person should act according to his convictions and not in accord with the feelings of the moment.[10]

Opposition to the Asklund-Wickbom approach tends to run along age or geographical lines. Many people over forty may have doubts about this approach, although the majority of

people are probably willing to let the activists on both sides argue the issue to a conclusion. Active opposition tends also to be more prevalent in certain rural areas, particularly in Småland and the northwest coastal area near Norway.

Until very recently, there has been no tendency in school classes to discuss or describe actual sexual intercourse, but student groups in the last year or so have been active in efforts to include such material in the curriculum. A letter to the author from the chief medical officer of the National Board of Education describes this new aspect of debate over sex education in Sweden:

> . . . at the present time there is a vivid discussion about a pamphlet from the RFSU (National Association for Sex Education). The pamphlet is regarded as rather advanced because of its detailed descriptions of intercourse and petting techniques. It is intended for the sixteen year old, and it is up to the local school board to decide if it should be used in the school. The pupils organization (S.E.C.O.) is very angry at the school leaders who have decided not to use it. Nevertheless, many do use it in their schools.[11]

It appears that in this debate, as in the more longstanding debate over the morality of pre-marital intercourse, that the young are quite willing to see a liberalizing of sex education.

Two other areas of the curriculum should be mentioned where the Asklund-Wickbom approach is sharply at variance with the treatment given in the original handbook. These are masturbation and contraception. The original handbook in its Lesson-Example for ages 11-13 says:

> *Masturbation* (self-abuse) is the name for producing sensations of pleasure by conscious irritation of the sexual organs. Masturbation occurs frequently among both boys and girls. It was once believed that masturbation produced illness of various kinds, but this is no longer held to be the case.[12]

In the Asklund-Wickbom book, a much more positive and accepting attitude is evinced:

> In puberty, young people often stimulate the sexual organs with their hands, or in other ways, to achieve gratification and release. . . . Both boys and girls engage in this practice, but it seems more common among boys. Self-gratification is natural and completely harmless . . . Adults also practice self-gratification. This is especially so among adults who have been accustomed to regular sexual relations, but who are in situations where these are curtailed. . . . Self-gratification can, therefore, be a way of dealing with problems arising from the sex drive.
>
> Self-gratification is harmless, natural, and nothing to feel guilty about.[13]

On contraception, the original handbook in its Lesson-Example for ages 14 to 16 limited its discussion to the following:

> . . . conception may quite well occur even if intercourse is broken off.
>
> There are other ways of preventing conception. Perhaps you know that there are certain means called *contraceptives*. . . The most widely used contraceptive is the *condom* (French letter), which is used by the man. Since the condom may burst, it is not a reliable protection against conception. The only other preventive which will be mentioned for the present is called the pessary, and is designed for use by the woman. The pessary is a bowl-shaped rubber membrane for covering the mouth of the uterus. . . It is a good protection, but it must be pointed out that there is no contraceptive which gives complete protection. . . Since you know that boys and girls who are still growing up should not have sexual relations, you will understand that contraceptives should not be used by them.[14]

In the Asklund-Wickbom approach and other recent books used by teachers mainly for 14 to 16 year olds, the various contraceptive devices are thoroughly described—the condom, intrauterine devices, the diaphragm, vaginal jellies and foam, and contraceptive oral pills. The rather high reliability of these procedures is pointed out, and there is no effort to discourage their use as a means of frightening young people into refraining from sexual intercourse.[15]

In spite of the lively debates and the sometimes rather acrimonious arguments about various aspects of sex education in Sweden, there is no doubt that Sweden is in the forefront in attempting to bring sex into the light for young people. Sex education in Sweden proceeds in a general social environment where rational attitudes toward sex have become much more prevalent than elsewhere. A much respected Swedish writer, Lars Gyllensten, probably expressed the attitude of a surprising portion of the Swedish population when he posited his own "Ten Commandments" for the modern age. His "Sixth Commandment" is:

> Thou shalt not spread venereal diseases, or bring unwanted children into the world, or expose other people to sexual violence. Also, you should play your part in keeping the birthrate as low as possible because altogether too many children are born. For the rest, you may devote yourself freely to sexual intercourse, masturbation, pornography and such other good things of this kind as your animal nature, in its grace, may cause you to desire.[16]

Most parents and teachers with whom the author talked considered it only natural that sex should be included in the school

curriculum. They generally felt that school could do a better job than the home. The commonsense attitude toward sex is perhaps illustrated by the fact that people in Sweden accept the idea of advertising contraceptives such as the condom in the newspapers and billboards, and show no concern when these items are sold openly in the stores or from vending machines on most busy street corners.

Data on the effects of 12 years of mandatory sex education are not extensive, although the government commission now revising the program has made some surveys by questionnaire, the results of which should be published by late 1968. As for general trends in Swedish illegitimacy, venereal disease, divorce and sexual crime, the trends show a mixed picture. Venereal disease in 1965 was at its highest incidence since 1919.[17] This upward trend is not unique to Sweden, and has occurred in most countries. The proportion of "illegitimate" (the term "out-of-wedlock" is used in Sweden) births to "legitimate" births was 9 per cent in the 1940's while in 1964 it had risen to about 13 per cent.[18] Again, many other countries have seen a sharp rise in illegitimacy over the past two decades. The Swedes are far more concerned about the venereal disease rate than illegitimacy, which has far less disturbing effects in Sweden than it has in the U.S. Divorce rates in Sweden have not changed much since 1951, and at the rate of one divorce to six marriages are a good deal lower than the American rate of one to four. Of course, many Swedes enter into a trial marriage when they become formally engaged, and a breakup of such a union doesn't count as divorce.

It is probably too early to assess truly the Swedish efforts at sex education. Much opposition and ineffectiveness has had to be overcome, and it is the next ten years that may show more clearly what effect it has had on certain objective measures. To gauge its effect on human happiness is more difficult.

Sex education in various communist countries has had to adjust to the shifting and twisting of the party line. On the whole, the attitude of school officials and political leaders in these countries has been to de-emphasize sexual knowledge and discussion on the grounds that student energy and school time should be devoted to making good socialist citizens who are technologically competent and who are devoted wholeheartedly to socialist reconstruction. Also it is clear that changing attitudes on the part of top party leaders toward the demographic situation in their

particular country has affected policies toward sexual matters, including marriage, divorce, birth control, abortion, sexual morality and sex education.

North Korea during the past fifteen years is a good example of a communist country where the regime has been uncompromisingly anti-Neo-Malthusian, extremely puritanical toward youthful sexual interests and consistently opposed to any direct inclusion of sex education in the school curriculum.

Part of the explanation for the North Korean attitude is, of course, the desire of the leaders to sustain the revolutionary impulse which they see threatened by any diversion of the people's interest toward such personal questions as love and marriage, sexual activity, and family size. Such diversion of interests to these questions is equated with Western "bourgeois" degradation and contamination. Youths are warned not to be drawn to personal pleasures, but to devote their passions to the construction of socialism and communism.

Along with the general desire of the North Korean regime to prevent any diversion from single-minded dedication to socialist construction is a very strong awareness on the part of North Korean leaders of the great inequality between the populations of North and South Korea. The population of North Korea is about 11 million while that of South Korea is nearly 30 million. This discrepancy has prevented any thaw in North Korea's denunciation of Neo-Malthusianism. This is in contrast to China and the Soviet Union where some rather tortured efforts have been made to back off from the extreme anti-Neo-Malthusianism of the 1950's. In North Korea, birth control is still equated with cannibalism and there is no place in the school curriculum for direct discussion of the facts or the morality of human sex. Even in biology classes for thirteen year olds, no mention of human sex is countenanced; teachers are told to teach about the planting and growth of trees, rice, cotton, corn, cabbage and potatoes.[19] In home economics classes girls are taught only to be polite, wear traditional garb, cook food, handle a budget, bow to elders, and maintain a respectful silence.[20] This is in sharp contrast to South Korean home economics classes where, in addition to traditional topics, family planning, pregnancy, child development and other sexual matters are discussed. Until North Korea's population is closer in numbers to that of the South the extreme puritanical avoidance of direct discussion of human sexual life and problems is likely.

The ideological situation in Communist China has been somewhat similar to that of North Korea, except that the possibility that there are too many Chinese is a factor that has brought the birth-control issue to the fore during various periods, such as the middle 1950's and the early and mid-1960's. Just as in North Korea, great concern has been shown in China toward directing all of the energy of youth toward socialist reconstruction. In speaking of the Chinese student's need to combine labor with study, a 1959 article in the Peking *People's Daily* stated that "because of their participation in the practice of labor . . . the students first experience a great change in the spiritual aspect and are taught the class viewpoint of the working class, the labor viewpoint, the mass viewpoint, the collective viewpoint, and the dialectical materialist viewpoint." [21]

It does not appear that any special effort has been made to introduce sex instruction into the school even during the periods when birth-control campaigns have had official sanction. During the period of the early 1960's, the regime was strongly supporting the idea of late marriage as a major weapon to reduce births. Articles appeared in periodicals directed to youth, which may have had some influence on school instruction. An article in 1962, directed to youth, developed at length the idea of late marriage and family planning:

> . . . if they (young people) get married too early, their energy will be dispersed on account of family life, and if they give birth to children and thus burden themselves with a family, their studies will be affected in an even greater extent: Because early marriage is such an impediment to studies many people in history who were determined to become learned refused to get married early. . . In the rural areas and factories, many young women have had to keep house and nurse chilldren at an early age. . . Some youths say, "Provided we practice contraception and have a planned family, early marriage will not produce great adverse effects on us." We say that in the case of youths who have already gotten married, it is of course good to have children late than early, thus to reduce somewhat the effects of early marriage. Planned birth is also good and is something which we advocate. However, this applies after all, only to youths who have already gotten married, and besides, things do not always turn out as planned.[22]

Articles appeared in various periodicals in 1962 extolling late marriage and contraception. Negative comments were made about women with four or five children, and detailed descriptions of condoms, diaphragms and jellies, were included.[23]

Chinese Communist leadership is obviously not particularly adverse to the "facts of life," but if concern over such matters seems to endanger single-minded ideological commitment to collectivist goals, then such interests must be foresworn. It seems likely, however, that the fact of over-population in China will force the regime reluctantly from time to time in coming decades to deal with sex, contraception, abortion, love and marriage on a much more frank basis than the rather puritanical ideology of the leadership would ideally prefer.

In the Soviet Union, during the early years after the Revolution, it was thought that légal and political emancipation of women, and a generally permissive attitude toward sexual behavior would speed the demise of the old Czarist patriarchal "bourgeois" family structure. All legal disabilities of women were abolished. Incest, bigamy, and adultery were no longer statutory crimes. *De facto* marriage was accorded equal status with those registered through civil ceremony. After abortion was legalized in 1920, hospitals, called Abortariums, were established in Moscow and Leningrad. Abortion in the cities, at least, became more common; for example, in 1935, there were 150,000 abortions in Moscow as compared with 70,000 live births.[24] Contraceptives were in short supply and seemed to be associated with Neo-Malthusianism which was thought to be "a bourgeois panacea for social ills."

After 1936, much of the early laxity toward marriage, sex and family was modified. Abortion was made illegal unless pregnancy was a threat to the health or life of the woman. Divorce was made more difficult. Contraceptives were still in short supply. Family allowances were introduced, and taxation was introduced to penalize people with fewer than three children.[25] This drastic shift of policy was obviously related to the fact that the new regime had in 1936 nearly twenty years of power and the old patriarchal traditional family ways no longer posed a threat. Also, great losses of people in wars, famines and epidemics occurring periodically from 1914 to 1934 indicated a change to a strong pro-natalist policy for reasons of state.

Since 1955, there has been a partial return to the liberality which existed in the 1920's. Abortion is again legal, some Neo-Malthusian ideas have been allowed to be aired, and it seems contraceptives are quite widely available.

The school situation in the Soviet Union during the 1920's was extraordinarily experimentalist and behaviorist. Rostow

points out that "it was not accidental that, in the course of his visit to the Soviet Union in the 1920's, John Dewey found the atmosphere congenial. Progressive education was practiced almost to the point of the 'withering away of the school.' " [26] By the mid-thirties all this had changed, and the school was moved sharply toward "strict, conservative training in useful techniques and methods." [27] Co-education in secondary schools was generally abolished in 1943, although this never became universal. This shift in school policies and philosophy roughly paralleled the changes which sex and family life traversed in the same period.

The treatment of sex and family in the Soviet schools during the 1920's was in accord with the experimental, environmentalist, non-traditional educational ethos of the time. It treated all problems as completely amenable to environmental influences. If the difference between the sexes, the so-called sexual drive, and the fascination of the young with matters related to sex were in many ways detrimental to the building of a new socially conscious communist citizen,[28] then it was necessary to act to overcome these survivals through social learning and by essentially ignoring any biological basis for these things. V. N. Kolbanovskii, writing in a 1964 Soviet education journal, criticized the attitude of the educators of the 1920's for ignoring the reality of sex. He pointed out that, in the 1920's, "the process of sexual development of children was ignored since, as it primarily involved natural laws, there arose the (supposed) danger of overemphasizing the biological." [29]

When the schools returned to traditional ways after 1936, and a stable family life became a major focus of Soviet concern, the attitude toward sex education merely changed from a general vagueness due to a wish to avoid biologicalizing or diverting energies to a vagueness based on the belief that explicit treatment might weaken the family and sexual morality, and reduce the number of births. Many of the attitudes toward sex once condemned as "Czarist" now became prevalent. This almost "Victorian" stance has lasted more or less unchanged for the last three decades. A survey of the Soviet curriculum indicated that, in the late 1950's, in the 10 year school, only in grade 8 is human biology touched, and even there human reproductive processes are left unmentioned unless the two hours devoted to the topic "Development of Organisms" devotes a little time to the subject.[30]

Even recent critics of the rather complete shunning of sex education in Soviet schools only wish to bring the subject to conscious treatment to combat what they feel is a spreading looseness in sexual morality. Kolbanovskii felt that teachers should bring up sexual topics in order to courageously combat immoral viewpoints:

> Some morally depraved people spread views among the youth to the effect that "maidenly honor" or a "woman's virtue" are narrow-minded prejudices which should have been overcome long ago, that love was given to man for his pleasure, and that if there is a "slip-up"—pregnancy —it is easy to get rid of it.[31]

In a 1963 article meant for Western consumption, the role of the Soviet teacher is idealized and one of the vignettes concerned a teacher's treatment of teen-age love. The gingerly treatment of the issues, the emphasis finally given to chastity and romantic love would satisfy the most ardent Victorian:

> I checked Alyosha's notebook. There was a note in it that he must have forgotten. It lay there unfolded. "Natasha, why do you go to the movies with another man?" And under it were the words: "What business is it of yours?"
>
> I had to organize a debate among the seniors on the question of friendship and love. That started an argument in the teachers' room. "Should we have a debate on this subject?" The principal, Anna Zakharovna, supported the idea.
>
> "Who said that the school should teach children to solve only the problems in the textbooks? What about the problems with which life confronts them? When problems like these come up, you can't go running over to the neighbor's girl for help, or check your answer with the book."
>
> The ideas expressed at the debate were as bright and disturbing as flames . . . The teacher also took the floor.
>
> "It seems to me that what is important in life is to wait for the beloved person, not to confuse him with anyone else, not to give your feelings, your tender, l g words to anyone else." [32]

Attitudes expressed toward such topics as masturbation in Kolbanovskii's article remind one of the usual stance people approved in the West during the nineteenth century and are in sharp contrast with the Swedish positions mentioned earlier:

> . . . and because the adolescents are uninformed and unprepared as regards questions of sex life, they frequently go through the stage of pubescence with great harm to themselves . . . the habit of onanism can have a grave effect upon the development of the personality.[33]

In general, there remains a very strong official aversion in the U.S.S.R. to any real liberalization of the treatment of sex. The

Young Communist League, as late as October, 1966, has protested vigorously against lectures having to do with reproduction and sex presented before mixed audiences.[34] The alien and enemy "bourgeois" world today is not so much the world of false and rigid morals, patriarchy, and exploitation of women; rather, it is now envisaged as the world of sexual looseness, un chastity, preoccupation with sex, suggestive dances and literature; a cynical disregard for high-thinking romantic monogamous love.

There are pressures to liberalize the sexual climate in the Communist countries. In China, the obvious difficulties overpopulation presents to economic development presses the regime to come to grips with sexual matters. In the U.S.S.R. the increasing influence of public opinion and the example of Western trends is slowly moving the regime to a more candid discussion of sexual issues.

The United States, with the exception of occasional "avant garde" groups, generally has treated sex with a mixture of repression and uneasy fascination. Only in the past decade or so does there seem to be developing a truly widespread alteration in the stance most people take toward sex. Some people have argued the main shift in American sexual behavior occurred in the 1920's, while the changes of the 1960's involve primarily a shift in attitude.[35] There were a number of personalities in the 1920's and 1930's who pleaded for a more rational attitude toward sex and programs of instruction in the schools. Judge Ben Lindsay was much maligned in Denver during the 1920's for advocating "companionate" or "trial" marriages. Harry Elmer Barnes complained steadily during the 1920's and 1930's about the lack of rational sex education. Writing in 1939, he argued:

> Today the sociologist hesitates to mention birth control and venereal prophylaxis, unless to condemn them, and he rarely describes these processes and methods in concrete detail. In a sane social and educational order such problems would be freely discussed and fully described.[36]

It is only in the last decade that any beginnings of a widely spread and fully discussed pattern of sex education in American schools has made much headway. The Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) was formed a few years ago by 38 specialists in education, sociology, medicine, religion and law to help existing sex education programs and to promote new ones. Dr. Mary Calderone, executive director of

SIECUS, argued for a continuing program of sex instruction in the schools for all ages:

> By the age of 10 or 11 a child should have full knowledge of the process of reproduction, given both at home and at school. In junior high school, students should consider the relational aspects of human and animal sex behavior. High schools should offer discussions of studies on venereal disease and unmarried parents.[37]

A pioneering program was instituted in 1957 in Evanston, Illinois, covering kindergarten children through those in the eighth grade, and has received extensive coverage. The program includes a very graphic discussion of where babies come from, sexual development of the young, venereal disease, differences between the sexes and so on. Much of the emphasis is on the family, the responsibility of fathers and mothers, comparisons between human families and reproduction units in the animal world. The main responsibility for presentation lies with the classroom teacher, as it is felt that an over-use of outside experts, such as doctors or nurses, would lend an aura of specialness and abnormality to the subject.[38] Although questions on contraception arise and are answered, there is no effort to instruct children on this topic specifically. Also, girls and boys are sometimes separated for filmstrip instruction on menstruation, masturbation, homosexuality, and sex organ development. Freedom is allowed the teacher to ignore or disagree with some of the moral precepts which often accompany these audio-visual aids. For example, one filmstrip audio section condemns masturbation in this way:

> When you are tempted to do it, get busy doing something else. Play hard. Read an interesting book. Or if it occurs at night, think of something good to do tomorrow or recite some prayers. Boys with religious beliefs about these things may find they help to resist the temptation.[39]

Teachers may delete this section or have an open discussion on the topic so that the children are not left with the view that this sentiment is the last word on the morality of masturbation.

Programs have been introduced in New York City, Anaheim, California, Jefferson County, Colorado (suburban Denver) and many other places. Most of the programs are more or less similar to the pattern in Evanston. They emphasize reproductive biology, a certain treatment of the etiquette of sex, and an em-

phasis on the need for solid family life and responsibility. Simon and Gagnon of the Institute of Sex Research at Indiana University criticized the typical new sex education programs on the following grounds, among others. They argue that the schools present sex as something that merely happens, not something that is deeply experienced and subjective; there is a bland "sex is fun" orientation; many students knew it all before; teachers do not really present the moral alternatives and leave the student to struggle to come to grips with his own concrete situations, and finally, they argue, we know less about sex than we think and schools may try to teach more than there is to be taught.[40]

The argument that American students know most of what is presented is perhaps partly true in some of the most emancipated areas and perhaps also in some ways among the urban lower classes. However, there is no thoroughgoing national study to indicate the degree of naïveté or sophistication among students on sexual questions. The author asked a capable sociology teacher in a Nashville high school, who had initiated some discussion of sexual issues, to ask two classes to hand in anonymous questions on sex which they either wanted discussed or answered in the classroom situation. In these two classes there were 50 students (about half girls and half boys) all of whom were 18 year old high school seniors. The teacher had excellent rapport with her students and the average ability of the students was generally in the top half of the senior class. The high school was in a somewhat better than average white neighborhood. The questions indicated a rather surprising degree of naïveté and bewilderment over many sex related problems. A few of the questions are included below which illustrate some recurring themes.

• • •

In your opinion, is premarital sex recommended for mature engaged couples?

Do older married couples (late 40's or 50's) still engage in sexual intercourse?

How many years can you take birth control pills?

What happens if a woman is so innocent that on her wedding night she becomes scared to death?

Is the government doing anything constructive about birth control?

Do you think that every marriage *has* to have sex all the time to survive?

After married people reach the age (such as our parents, generally) do they still continue their sexual relations?

How soon do you grow tired of sex after marriage?

When two eggs are fertilized is it from two different times of intercourse or the same one?

Does a strong douche often prevent pregnancy if a woman douches soon after sexual relations?

Does a male have to be all the way inside the female before she can get pregnant?

Is it easier to get a virgin pregnant than a girl who isn't a virgin?

If during intercourse the male gets out before releasing his sperm and ejects at the opening, is there still danger of pregnancy?

How safe are rubbers?

If you cannot get pregnant in one position, why can you get pregnant in another?

Can a person have intercourse with a Negro and have a black and white spotted baby?

Do you think the United States should stop having an abortion law?

Are there dangerous outcomes from inter-racial marriages?

Is it possible for a man or woman of their late 60's to have a baby?

Would you recommend more casual relationships with prostitutes or a meaningful (but not necessarily marriage oriented) relationship with an equal?

What are the stages of a woman in marriage that makes it seem so painful and drab?

Do you condone animal love (free love) amongst groups of married couples (exchange of mates)?

What is your exact opinion on pre-marital sex?

How can a person get another person, if the other person this certain person wants, wants this person for sex only, and the other person loves him mentally?

Are some positions in intercourse immoral?

Can a woman get infection from abortion?

How do drugs such as "Spanish fly" affect the body?

Do you think it's right for a husband to have affairs? I heard statistics that say about 90% of 100% have an affair?

Does the man have to be fully penetrated before the woman can become pregnant?

Should a couple either have premarital sex or wait until after the wedding night before having intercourse; because of all the excitement of the wedding?

How can one tell if he or she is over-sexed?

Is there danger to the body in using contraceptives during intercourse?

* * *

In general, sex education in America mirrors the extreme heterogeneity of school quality, curriculum, clientele and leadership which characterizes the educational system of the U.S. The fervor of dedicated individuals, if the social ethos is reasonably ripe, can bring surprising change in the U.S. as it has in bringing about some openness about sex in school and society. The wish to placate important pressure groups, particularly religious groups, has and will cause those wishing to open the classroom to sex to be wary of such obviously crucial topics as birth control, pre-marital sexual relations and homosexuality. The universal and increasingly liberalized sex instruction of Sweden which reaches all children is perhaps far in the future for the United States. On the other hand, since the individualistic yet imitative spirit of American education does not, in our time, have to be shackled to the kind of secular puritanism which permeates efforts to grope with the sexual problem as is the case in the Soviet Union. Much can and will be done.

---

[1] Lars Gustafson, *The Public Dialogue in Sweden* (Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt and Sons, 1964), pp. 99-100.

[2] Sven Wernstrom, *Aftonbladet* (Stockholm), October 26, 1961. Cited in Birgitta Linnér, *Sex and Society in Sweden* (New York: Pantheon, 1967), pp. 123-124.

[3] Linner, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-126.

[4] *Handbook on Sex Instruction in Swedish Schools* (Stockholm: Royal Board of Education, 1956), pp. 50-51.

[5] J. Strömner, *Dagen* (Stockholm), November 5, 1963.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Lewi Petrus, *Dagen* (Stockholm), April 1, 1962.

[8] Maj-Brigt Bergström-Walan, *Dagens Nyheter* (Stockholm), June 6, 1962.

[9] Lis Asklund and Torsten Wickbom, *Vagen Till Mognad* (Stockholm: Radio Sweden, 1967), pp. 80-81.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[11] Letter from G. Rodhe, Chief Medical Officer, National Board of Education, to R. M. Bjork, December 21, 1967.

[12] *Handbook, op. cit.*, p. 40.

[13] Asklund and Wickbom, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-98.

[14] *Handbook, op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.

[15] Asklund and Wickbom, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-47.

[16] Lars Gyllensten, "Ten Commandments" in Lars Bäckström and Göran Palm, eds., *Sweden Writes* (Stockholm: The Swedish Institute, 1965), p. 227.

[17] Birgitta Linnér, *Society and Sex in Sweden* (Stockholm: The Swedish Institute, 1966), p. 32.

[18] Linnér, *Sex and Society in Sweden*, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

[19] *People's Education* (Pyongyang: Ministry of Elementary Education, February, 1966), pp. 7-8.

[20] *Technical Education* (Pyongyang: Ministry of Elementary Education, August, 1966), pp. 38-39.

[21] Yang-Hsiu-feng, "China's Educational Enterprise Goes Through the Process of Great Revolution and Great Evolution," *People's Daily* (Peking), October 8, 1959, in Stewart Fraser, ed., *Chinese Communist Education* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1965), p. 55.

[22] Yang Hsiu, "For Late Marriage," *China Youth* (Peking), No. 11, June 1, 1962, *passim*.

[23] Cheng Lin, "Editor's reply to a reader's letter 'What's to be Done if One Has Married Young?' by K'ai Ko," *Chung-kuo Ch'ing-nien Pao* (Peking), July 7, 1962; Yeh Kung Shoa, "My Views on the Problems of Young People's Marriage, Love and Children, *Chung-kuo Ch'ing-nien Pao* (Peking), July 21, 1962; Shu Ming-Yen, "Several Contraceptives Recommended for General Use," *Kung-jen Jih-Bao* (Peking), July 24, 1962.

[24] Ralph Thomlinson, *Population Dynamics* (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 412.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] W. W. Rostow, *The Dynamics of Soviet Society* (New York: New American Library, 1954), p. 108.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[28] The Komsomol, young communists mainly in their late teens, had had a strong influence on the school climate in the 1920's. They emphasized their own solidarity by fostering a "proletarian" morality which frowned on alcohol, tobacco and sexual looseness. See Ralph T. Fisher, Jr., *Pattern for Soviet Youth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 109.

[29] V. N. Kolbanovskii, "The Sex Upbringing of the Rising Generation," *Sovietskaya Pedagogika*, November 3, 1964. Translated in *The Soviet Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3, Fall, 1964, p. 57.

[30] William K. Medlin, Clarence B. Lindquist, Marshall Schmitt, *Soviet Education Programs* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 57-60.

[31] Kolbanovskii, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

[32] Margarita Zatsepina, "A Teacher's Diary," *U.S.S.R.*, No. 10, October, 1963, p. 43.

[33] Kolbanovskii, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[34] *New York Times*, October 9, 1966, p. 37.

[35] *New York Times*, July 11, 1966, p. 31.

[36] Harry Elmer Barnes, *Society in Transition*, 8th edition (New York: Prentice Hall, 1946), p. 418.

[37] Mary S. Calderone, "Teenagers and Sex," *PTA Magazine*, October, 1965, p. 6.

[38] William Barry Furlong, "It's a Long Way from the Birds and the Bees," *New York Times*, June 11, 1967, Section 6, p. 48.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[40] William Simon and John H. Gagnon, "The Pedagogy of Sex," *Saturday Review*, November 18, 1967, pp. 74-76, 91-92.

CHAPTER V

Latin America: Educational Perceptions

HAROLD R. W. BENJAMIN

Emeritus Professor of Education
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee

One hundred twenty years ago Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, a principal pioneer in the Western Hemisphere in the fields of international and comparative education, wrote a book called *Education, the Basis of Prosperity in the United States of America.* This was a profound and entertaining work. It discarded the usual tradition-bound concepts which the North Americans as well as the Latin Americans had inherited from Europe and had for the most part tried to follow. At the same time it was written in the felicitous style which had already made Sarmiento, the "Prophet of the Pampas," well known in literary circles at home and abroad. Its primary contribution lay in its clear recognition of the truth that every country has only one primary resource, namely, its people, and the proper exploitation of that resource is effected by an education of scope and power.

It is customary in some circles in the United States to imply that Sarmiento's respect for Horace Mann and his admiration of the system of teacher-education which Mann had inaugurated in Massachusetts later caused the Argentine statesman to imitate Mann's methods. Sarmiento has indeed been called by North American enthusiasts the "Horace Mann of South America." In my opinion, this is a disservice to the memory of both those men. Horace Mann lacked the years of classroom service which made Sarmiento first and always a schoolmaster. Mann was a lawyer who moved into public education from the top as the head of the Massachusetts state school system. Sarmiento was a rural teacher who moved into educational reform from the bottom. He was also a revolutionist, and he regarded education as a potentially great revolutionary instrument, as indeed it is.

In the more than a century which has passed since Sarmiento's first visit to the United States, many North Americans and Latin Americans have tried to follow the example of the great Argentine statesman in improving their own educational systems by studying those of the other countries in the hemisphere. A steady stream of Latin Americans going north to the universities and colleges of the United States could also be seen in most of those years. Many North Americans at the same time have worked on various educational projects in Latin American countries. Private agencies in the United States, and in recent years government agencies, have poured money into a large number of projects to "help" the Latin Americans improve their educational programs and procedures.

These activities have never been more complex and generous than at the present time. It is hard to find a state in the Union that does not have at least one university or college working on some plan to "aid" a Latin American country in the improvement of its schools. In no other region of the world is there an industrially advanced country which has been trying so hard on so large a scale and at such expense to its own people to assist other less advanced countries educationally as has this country in relation to its Latin American neighbors.

What have been the chief results of all these efforts? If we discard our usual blinders of evangelism in this matter and look critically at the Latin American countries as developers and recipients of education, we must indeed have our spirits chastened and our hearts humbled. It seems only yesterday that secondary schools in Bolivia were being "revolutionized," largely with North American help. Today Bolivia is one of the most backward countries in the world. In spite of its great mineral, farm and forest resources, the great masses of its common people constitute one of the least developed resources between Punta Arenas at the southern tip of the Americas and Point Barrow at the northernmost point. Nowhere is there a population so hungry and oppressed, so burdened with poverty and illiteracy and so neglected by its usual governments of colonels and majors, with an occasional general and captain thrown into the cabinet to demonstrate the current regime's concern for democracy! The only other country in the Western Hemisphere which can compete successfully with Bolivia for the dubious title of being the most backward is Haiti, the little French-speaking Negro republic occupying the western one-third of the Caribbean island of

Hispaniola. In the early days of Unesco, that organization devoted intense effort and a considerable amount of money to pulling Haiti out of the mud and hunger into which it had been sunk ever since it broke away from France in 1804 under Toussaint L'Ouverture. Now Dr. Francois Duvalier, president for life, operates the most repressive dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere, and the common people of the country show practically no signs of ever experiencing Unesco's kindly educational efforts of twenty years ago. Haiti is about the size of Maryland, but it has 1.5 million more people than Maryland. It also has many more mineral resources than Maryland, but most of its resources are underdeveloped because its greatest resource—its people—is grossly underdeveloped. Even its clergymen are largely imported from France and Quebec. It is the only Catholic country in the Western Hemisphere which seems unable even to provide the training for its local priests.

At the other end of the scale of national development, of course, are countries like Argentina and Mexico. It would be particularly impolite to comment on those great nations' difficulties with their educational systems at the present time when many of our own difficulties in the United States are so similar. As Mexican paratroopers during the summer of 1968 clubbed secondary-school pupils to the ground with freely-swinging gun butts, it was interesting to hear that Mexican protesters were shouting, "Down with the Gringo imperialists!" and similar slogans to indicate where they thought the blame for the soldiers' non-permissive tactics ought properly to rest. In Argentina since the days of Juan Manuel de Rosas and Domingo Sarmiento the national government has swung in pendulum-like fashion from so-called democracies to dictatorships.

We have not yet mentioned the largest of the Latin American countries, Brazil. It has had massive educational and financial aid from the United States for many years with the chief result that when students protest against almost anything, they employ two chief arguments, (1) a shout of "Down with the North American capitalistic robbers," and (2) a fist-sized rock with which to break American Embassy windows in Rio de Janeiro.

Is it possible that educational cooperation between the United States and its Latin American neighbors has not been as successful as the expenditure of money and energy seemed to promise simply because of misconceptions on both sides of what national systems of education should and could do for their people? Let us

briefly consider the main problems facing these people in the light of the role of education in meeting them.

The first fact of international life in the Western Hemisphere is that the United States and Canada are moving into a new historical era which is putting them farther away from their Latin American neighbors year by year and indeed hour by hour, so rapid is the change. I refer to the increasing influence of the electronic devices which are commonly classified as computers. It is fast moving the North Americans out of the industrial-technological era into what has been called the new "technetronic age," * in which people in the most developed countries will have to change within the next few decades even more than they did when they moved from hunting and food gathering savagery to pastoral-agricultural barbarism, and certainly more than when they moved from the latter stage into the industrial-technological era which they presently occupy. The human intellect will extend its reasoning ability by the use of computers just as the human body has extended its mobility by the use of automobiles and airplanes. I prefer to call this new age the *humanotronic* era. I put the *humano* in the term because I am convinced that the condition of man is going to be, and is now being affected more profoundly by these new electronic devices than is our technology.

The question has sometimes been raised, and not only in science fiction but in serious discussion among scientists and social scientists, of the possibility of the new electronic machines rebelling and making men their slaves. In realistic terms, it is my considered opinion that this possibility will always stay in the realm of fantasy. A modern computer of the utmost sophistication is no more capable of rebelling against its human masters than is that much earlier "thinking machine," the written word. But it is capable, just as the book has been for centuries, of changing the basic human attitudes toward the whole body of work we call *reasoning*. Just as there is no doubt now that even the simplest adding machine can perform that arithmetic computation better than any unaided human being, so it is equally clear that the modern electronic computer is vastly more efficient in that quality which modern men generally rate highest in themselves, namely, *rationality*. It can make logical decisions from a study of tremendous volumes of information and do so at a speed

* See Zbigniew Brezezinski, "America in the Technetronic Age," in *Encounter*, Vol. XXX, January, 1968, pp. 16-26.

and with an accuracy that no human being can hope to rival. If indeed most of our local, national and world ills arise from irrationality or illogical thinking, we shall have to turn over to the computers those problems which no human beings have the memory banks and the organized circuits to handle. What kind of education, for example, should we seek for our children in this society on the threshhold of the new humanotronic era? What kind of teachers shall we provide for them? Do Bolivia and Haiti need the same kind of teachers? The same kinds of schooling? How many people are we going to have in the Western Hemisphere by the year 2000? How are we going to feed them? But are we serious when we say we want to solve our human problems by rational methods? Do we want to solve the problem of overpopulation and massive starvation by rationality or by the infallibility of an elderly gentleman in Rome? Perhaps not; perhaps we have a few fingers crossed when we say that we appeal to reason. We may be like Omar Khayyam with respect to alcohol in the famous quatrain as translated from the Persian by Edward Fitzgerald:

> Indeed, indeed, repentance oft before
> I swore, but was I sober when I swore?
> And then, and then came spring, and rose-in-hand
> My threadbare penitence a-pieces tore.

I am told that at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology computing capacity doubles every two years. The machines have progressed in their engineering from valves to transistors to integrated circuits in only a few years, and at the same time there have been corresponding changes in organization and programming to keep up with the growing complexity and speed of the advanced computers.

At the time of this writing the most advanced computer I have yet heard about is the one that the Burroughs Company is building for the University of Illinois. It is called "Illiac IV." The Burroughs people say that it will be 500 times faster than any computer now in existence and 100 times faster than any other computer now being developed. It is really an assembly of computers, 256 of them, working independently or collectively as directed by four control units. Each of the 256 processors is individually quite a computer in itself. It incorporates the latest high-technology of "large-scale integration" of silicon chips, with working circuits so small that 6,000 of them would not cover a

postage stamp. Illiac IV is designed to handle organizational problems of interconnected networks of computers. It will make problems of extreme complexity susceptible to solution by computing methods.

I spend this much attention on these highly sophisticated computers because they illustrate the kind of hardware a country in the *humanotronic* era will need. As the two chief countries of North America (the United States and Canada) move into this new era they will be even further removed than they are now from the Latin American countries, many of which are still largely in the pastoral-agricultural era. It will be even more difficult than today to pass educational "aid" to them from Canada and the United States.

I believe that the only feasible way to help Latin American countries educationally will be to lend them skilled personnel who will show them how in their own institutions they can set up training programs for their own people to learn how to attack their own problems in their own back and front yards. These advisors will have to be people who are trained in the field of comparative education. They cannot be people who will assume that the University of Brazil, for example, needs just as sophisticated a computer as the University of Illinois, and who will be delighted to obtain sufficient grants from the Ford Foundation or the United States government to build such a computer in Rio de Janeiro or Quito or Caracas.

At the risk of repeating well-worn truths to the point of banality, let us here enumerate the two chief principles for effectively building or improving a national system of education:

I. All schools and higher educational programs must serve to change the ways of a people in the direction of their own needs, hopes and dreams. Nobody else can do their dreaming for them.

II. The processes of building and improving educational programs must be done by the people themselves. Bolivian universities and schools must be planned, organized and operated by Bolivians. The only people who can reform and expand education in Haiti are Haitians.

To these principles we can add a working rule to prevent misunderstandings for any foreign educational advisor in any country of the world. His greatest task is to persuade the people of the country to believe in these two principles, without any if's, and's, but's or maybe's. If they have that belief, they have a chance to develop the correct practice; if they do not have the

belief, an army of advisors, each handing out monetary "aid" by the handfuls, will be of no avail.

In simple illustration of the need for *belief,* I close with a story told to me recently:

Four friends were together on a business trip by air when the aircraft suddenly exploded. The next thing these four travelers knew they were all together again in the nether regions shoveling coal into one of Satan's big furnaces.

"Ah, well," said the Catholic. "I can see why I am here. I neglected my religious duties. I ate meat whenever I felt like it, and I told my wife to go ahead and use the pill even after the Pope had told her not to do so. I deserve to go to hell."

"I, too," said the Methodist, "am a sinner, and I had this punishment coming to me. I played cards on Sunday for money, and I drank bourbon whiskey every day I could get it."

"In my case it is also understandable," said the Episcopalian. "I have been a miserable sinner and the good is not in me. For too long I have left undone the things I ought to have done and I have done the things I certainly ought not to have done."

The fourth man remained silent as he kept on shoveling coal. His comrades turned toward him. "You," they said compassionately, "are an agnostic, we know. Have you no comments on being here?"

The fourth man paused to brush the sweat out of his eyes and then replied firmly, "I do not believe I *am* here!"